

10206. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of Harry Grossman, suggesting the Grossman equality plan for national recovery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10207. By Mr. MERRITT of New York: Resolution of the National Restaurant Association, in convention assembled in Chicago, October 11, 1935, voicing its objection to the continuance of Government competition with private enterprise in the operation of restaurants, and respectfully petitioning the President of the United States to take immediate steps to have such Government-operated restaurants either discontinued or thrown open to the highest bidder to operate; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

10208. Also, resolution of Scarsdale Post, No. 52, Department of New York, American Legion, thoroughly endorsing the Dies bill (H. R. 5921), introduced in the Seventy-fourth Congress, designed to correct the immigration laws and preserve the United States to its law-abiding citizens, as essential to public safety; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

10209. Also, resolution of the National Guard Association of the State of New York, at Syracuse, N. Y., January 18, 1936, that the members of the National Guard Association of the State of New York recommend that the Congress of the United States be requested to enact legislation authorizing an allowance of \$35 per month for quarters to each enlisted man of the United States Army detailed to duty with the National Guard as sergeant-instructor while on such duty; and that such payments and also any payments heretofore made for rental of quarters for such noncommissioned officers shall be considered as an allowance to the individual; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

10210. Also, resolution of the Congo Club, of Flushing, N. Y., expressing the belief that additional taxation at the present time is unwarranted, and recommending that the necessary revenue be derived through stringent economies in governmental bureaus and governmental expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10211. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Celia A. Warner and 28 other members of the Eugene Central Woman's Christian Temperance Union, urging the enactment of House bill 8739; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10212. By Mr. PATTERSON: Petition of L. E. Bush and 56 other citizens of Montgomery County, Kans., favoring the passage of the Guyer bill (H. R. 8739) for liquor control in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10213. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of William Loughlin Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing a tax on perilla oil as a linseed substitute; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10214. Also, petition of the Downtown Owners' Committee, New York City, concerning airplane landing field at Governors Island; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10215. Also, petition of Congo Varnish Works, Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the placing of a tax on perilla oil as a linseed substitute; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10216. Also, petition of Hilo Varnish Corporation, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging support of House bill 10501, providing for a 2-year extension of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10217. Also, petition of the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, Washington, D. C., urging the extension of title I of the National Housing Act (H. R. 10501); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10218. By Mr. STEFAN: Petition of 43 citizens of Spencer, Nebr., asking the Congress to enact legislation at this session to indefinitely extend all existing star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon to an equal basis with that paid for other forms of mail transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10219. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the United Aircraft Corporation; to the Committee on Rules.

10220. Also, petition of the city of Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Grant, O Lord, our God, that each Member of the Congress may have some token of Thy thought of him and feel the presence of Thy blessing. Bring near to us some sense of Thy care and of Thy ministry to our needs. O give us inspiration that shall guide and incite us to go forward and follow on to know the Lord. We thank Thee that Thou art the universal Father and with Thee there is neither Jew nor Gentile, bond or free, but all are Thy children in the folds of the Father's heart. Convert us, dear Lord, to humility, to self-sacrifice, to unfailing kindness, and to the love that casts out fear as well as wrath. Grant that our strength and knowledge may be enlisted in behalf of weakness and ignorance. We pray for all churches and all those instruments throughout our land seeking to destroy barbarism and to turn back the streams of crime and vice which so sorely afflict our country. In the name of our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1381. An act to amend Public Law No. 249, Seventy-first Congress, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of material no longer needed by the Navy";

H. R. 1415. An act to provide for the establishment of the Richmond National Battlefield Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1470. An act for the relief of Carl A. Butler.

H. R. 1867. An act for the relief of Orville E. Clark;

H. R. 2110. An act for the relief of W. A. Harriman;

H. R. 2156. An act for the relief of Cecelia Callahan.

H. R. 2157. An act for the relief of Howard Donovan;

H. R. 2165. An act for the relief of Charles A. Gettys;

H. R. 2527. An act for the relief of Mrs. Amber Walker;

H. R. 2923. An act for the relief of Misner Jane Humphrey;

H. R. 3557. An act for the relief of Helena C. VonGroning and Stephan VonGroning;

H. R. 3565. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to effect exchange of certain rights-of-way in Hawaii;

H. R. 3864. An act for the relief of Gladys Robbins;

H. R. 4047. An act granting 6 months' pay to James Zanetti;

H. R. 4084. An act for the relief of Charles D. Jeronimus; H. R. 4171. An act for the relief of Look Hoon and Lau Hoon Leong;

H. R. 4210. An act for the relief of Anthony Nowakowski;

H. R. 4292. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant rights-of-way to the Arlington & Fairfax Railway Co. across the Fort Myer Reservation, Va.;

H. R. 4777. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Army of Vincent P. Rousseau;

H. R. 4925. An act to authorize and direct the Comptroller General to settle and allow the claim of George P. Money for fees for services rendered;

H. R. 5181. An act for the relief of the Progressive Commercial Co. of Philadelphia, Pa.;

H. R. 5474. An act for the relief of Lt. M. T. Grubham;

H. R. 5525. An act for the relief of George Current;

H. R. 5747. An act for the relief of Gordon McGee;

H. R. 5876. An act for the relief of Elmer H. Ackerson;

H. R. 5916. An act to authorize the conveyance by the United States to the State of Michigan of the former United States lighthouse supply depot, St. Joseph, Mich., for State naval force purposes;

H. R. 5964. An act for the relief of Carl F. Yeager;  
 H. R. 6254. An act for the relief of David N. Aiken;  
 H. R. 6708. An act to authorize the presentation of a Distinguished Flying Cross to Lt. Col. Francis T. Evans, United States Marine Corps;

H. R. 7001. An act for the relief of Alice Markham Kavanaugh;

H. R. 7486. An act to authorize the appointment of midshipmen from among honor graduates of "honor schools" and from among members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps;

H. R. 7875. An act to provide for the transfer of certain land in the city of Charlotte, Mich., to such city;

H. R. 8024. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to dispose of material no longer needed by the Army;

H. R. 8172. An act to authorize the transfer by the United States to the county of Mohave, Ariz., of all public lands in sections 20, 28, and 30, township 20 north, range 15 west, Gila and Salt River meridian, for public park, recreational, and other municipal purposes;

H. R. 8437. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice the healing art in the District of Columbia to Dr. Arthur B. Walker;

H. R. 8821. An act to define the crime of bribery and to provide for its punishment;

H. R. 8872. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Woman's Club of the city of Paducah, Ky., the silver service in use on the U. S. S. *Paducah*;

H. R. 8966. An act for the relief of World War soldiers who were discharged from the Army because of minority or misrepresentation of age; and

H. J. Res. 356. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Pan American Exposition to be held in Tampa, Fla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1362. An act for the relief of Ramey Bros., of El Paso, Tex.;

H. R. 4086. An act for the relief of Ellis Duke, also known as Elias Duke;

H. R. 7110. An act to authorize the President to bestow the Congressional Medal of Honor upon Brig. Gen. Robert H. Dunlap, United States Marine Corps, deceased;

H. R. 8458. An act to provide for vacations to Government employees; and for other purposes;

H. R. 8459. An act to standardize sick leave and extend it to all civilian employees;

H. R. 9130. An act to authorize the incorporated city of Skagway, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, and for such purpose to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$12,000, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 488. Joint resolution to close Military Road.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3. An act to regulate commerce in firearms;

S. 536. An act for the relief of Ada Mary Tornau;

S. 2188. An act for the relief of the estate of Frank B. Niles;

S. 2336. An act granting compensation to Mary Weller;

S. 2517. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Navy of Walter M. Graesser, a lieutenant (junior grade), United States Navy, retired;

S. 2747. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear the claim of the Canal Dredging Co.;

S. 2869. An act to legalize the use of emergency relief funds for the construction of armories for the National Guard;

S. 2922. An act for the relief of Rose Stratton;

S. 3125. An act for the relief of J. A. Hammond;

S. 3161. An act to amend section 13 (c) of the act entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor-vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, etc.", approved March 3, 1925, as amended;

S. 3257. An act to amend the World War Adjusted Compensation Act;

S. 3333. An act for the relief of DeForest Loys Trautman, lieutenant, United States Navy;

S. 3367. An act for the relief of James Gaynor;

S. 3395. An act to authorize the acquisition of the railroad tracks, trestle, and right-of-way of the Gulf Power Co. at the naval air station, Pensacola, Fla.;

S. 3410. An act to exempt from taxation receipts from the operation of Olympic Games if donated to the State of California, the city of Los Angeles, and the county of Los Angeles;

S. 3514. An act to regulate the manufacturing, dispensing, selling, and possession of narcotic drugs in the District of Columbia;

S. 3521. An act to authorize an exchange of land between the Waianae Co. and the Navy Department;

S. 3586. An act to authorize the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Treasury to lend Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and other needed equipment for use at the National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America; and to authorize the use of property in the District of Columbia and its environs by the Boy Scouts of America at their National Jamboree to be held during the summer of 1937;

S. 3655. An act for the relief of the Vermont Transit Co. Inc.;

S. 3663. An act for the relief of William Connelly, alias William E. Connoley;

S. 3761. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to patent certain land to the town of Wamsutter, Wyo.;

S. 3777. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to execute an agreement of indemnity to the First Granite National Bank, Augusta, Maine;

S. 3860. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to amend the National Defense Act", approved May 28, 1928; and

S. 3872. An act for the relief of the present leader of the Army Band.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and insert therein three speeches made on the subject of The Way Out—Taxation or General Inflation, one speech being my own, another by Mr. Rukeyser, the financial writer of the Hearst papers, and another by John T. Flynn, a financial writer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, I question whether those speeches from outside ought to be printed in the Record.

Mr. PATMAN. I should not like to put mine in unless I put in the others. I think in fairness the other speeches ought to be put in.

Mr. RICH. The only question is this, that when we permit speeches of outside people to be put in the Record it will make it appear so that we will not recognize it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. LAMBETH. Reserving the right to object, I have just come into the Hall, and I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas what he proposes to insert?

Mr. PATMAN. Three speeches that were made in the discussion last night on The Way Out—Inflation or Taxes. One is by myself, and the other by Mr. Rukeyser, financial writer for the Hearst papers, and another by John T. Flynn, journalist and financial writer. I think they will be interesting to the country and furnish valuable information.

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, if the House will permit me further to reserve the right to object, I have just come from

the Committee on Appropriations which is now considering the legislative appropriation bill, containing appropriations for congressional printing, including the operation of the Government Printing Office.

As chairman of the House Committee on Printing, I was invited to be present, together with the Public Printer and others. I dislike very much to interpose an objection in matters of this kind, but I am taking this opportunity, with the indulgence of the House, and also of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], who reserved an objection, to make a brief statement.

A practice has grown up here during the past few years, which was not in vogue when I came here 5 years ago, of printing outside matters in the RECORD. It has gotten to the point where it has become the duty of the House—not simply the duty of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], or the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], or the chairman of the Committee on Printing—to interpose objections.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBETH. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has made a request to insert in the RECORD matters which are doubtless interesting to Members of Congress and to the public. The question resolves itself into this: Where is the end? What is going to be the line between what ought to go into the RECORD and what ought not to go into the RECORD? I have a responsibility to the House as chairman of the Committee on Printing, and I want to make this clear: The position which these gentlemen hold, and I hold with them, is this: Members ought to have the right to insert their own remarks in the RECORD, and nobody has ever objected to any Member extending his own remarks without any limit, nor have they objected to the remarks of high officials of the Federal Government or of even a State government being inserted in the Appendix of the daily RECORD. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is interested in this subject of inflation, as are many Members of the House. Some of us hold opposing views. Others are interested in other subjects; and if the practice continues, it will grow to inserting, ad infinitum, without limitation, extraneous matters into the RECORD, however great the interest in them may be to the Members of the House, or even to the country. Where will it all end, and how much will it cost the taxpayers?

I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman state to the House how much the cost of the RECORD has increased in the last 4 or 5 years?

Mr. LAMBETH. I cannot offhand give the exact figures, but they will appear in the hearings shortly to be published in connection with the legislative appropriation bill. The gentleman knows well, because he has been here a long time, and those of us who have been here only a short time know, that the volume of the RECORD and the cost of the RECORD have increased year by year until the point has been reached where, in my opinion, the time has come when we ought to consider very seriously the matter of policy in connection with these extensions of outside matters in the RECORD. What I have said is not a reflection on any Member, and certainly my friend from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] will not misconstrue my intentions in making these remarks, which I had not intended to make at this time, as being personal to him. Further replying to the gentleman from New York, I take the position that these things are extraneous and irrelevant. I do not wish to put myself or the committee of which I happen to be the chairman in the position of being a board of censors or critics, but I am trying to carry out what I deem to be the responsibility that rests upon my shoulders more, perhaps, than upon the shoulders of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], although I think responsibility rests upon every Member of the House to protect the RECORD.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the chairman of the Committee on Printing has made this statement this morning. I have been very much interested in this proposition and have made similar statements on several occasions.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

#### CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise for a correction of the RECORD. On Wednesday, February 19, 1936, on page 2372 the RECORD, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ZIONCHECK] made the following unanimous-consent request:

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution introduced by me on January 6 and a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] on the 29th of January, an amended resolution of mine on the 6th of February, and an amended resolution of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] of the 14th day of February.

To that request the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] objected. Then a few moments later, as appears on the top of the next column on the same page of the RECORD, Mr. ZIONCHECK made the following request:

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD and to include therein four short resolutions on the Townsend investigation.

To that request I objected. Just before we adjourned on that day the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ZIONCHECK], on page 2400 of the RECORD, made the following request:

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein some excerpts from certain resolutions, as little as possible in order to get the thought over.

To that request I objected. Then Mr. ZIONCHECK made the following request:

Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

To that request no objection was made. My attention has been called to the extension of Mr. ZIONCHECK under that request, appearing on pages 2468 and 2469 of the daily RECORD of that day. In the extension of those remarks Mr. ZIONCHECK has included House Resolution 418, which is the resolution that was referred to in the original request, and was the original resolution introduced on February 14 by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL]. I have compared the text of this resolution included in his remarks with the original resolution. I think it is an exact copy, word for word; and if so, it is in violation of the rules of the House. I ask for a ruling by the Speaker.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In the event the Chair should rule it was a violation of the rules of the House, can the gentleman suggest any remedy?

Mr. SNELL. I should move to strike it from the RECORD.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SNELL. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ZIONCHECK] had made none of the previous requests and got permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD, does the gentleman from New York contend that he could not quote from the resolutions or the bill?

Mr. SNELL. That is probably a fair question. If the gentleman had received general permission to extend his own remarks, then if he had made a short quotation, I doubt if anybody would have raised the question; still I believe it technically against the rules; but when a Member makes a request to extend his own remarks and include certain specific resolutions, and that is objected to on account of those resolutions, I claim that he has no right to do it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SNELL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. ZIONCHECK] did not actually quote the resolution. He quoted about four whereases, and there must have been twenty-odd in the original resolution. He only quotes the opening words of the resolving part of the resolution.

Mr. SNELL. If the gentleman will look at the bottom of page 2468 of the daily RECORD, he will find just what was quoted, and it is word for word, complete, of House Resolution 418.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; he quotes the entire resolving part of the resolution. That is correct.

Mr. SNELL. No; he quotes the entire resolution that I objected to. It is what the gentleman asked permission to do, and I objected to it at the time, and I still object to his doing it when the permission of the House was denied him.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the request for permission to extend remarks should and must apply only to the remarks of the gentleman who makes the request, and that it does not authorize the insertion of newspaper articles or any other matter outside of his own remarks. If a Member desires to quote or to include in his remarks statements of the kind referred to, specific authority should be asked of the House and should be obtained before that insertion is made.

The Chair calls the attention of the House to the fact that the Chair has endeavored in most instances, at least, when a Member submits a request of that sort, to restate it, so that the House may understand just what the request is.

This matter has been before the House on previous occasions. Section 3479 of Cannon's Precedents reads:

Authorizations to extend remarks in the Record are strictly construed, and it is not in order under leave to print to insert other material than that designated in the request.

There was a specific ruling on the subject by Mr. Longworth, a former distinguished Speaker of this House, in which he made this statement:

The Chair thinks that an extension is limited to an extension of the remarks the gentleman himself made, and that specific authority would be necessary to extend remarks by printing newspaper and magazine articles or other documents. The Chair thinks a Member would not have that right unless he receives specific authority from the House.

The Chair concurs in the ruling made by Mr. Longworth and also in the syllabus just read.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to expunge those remarks from the permanent Record.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman move to expunge all the remarks or simply the quotation?

Mr. SNELL. I do not care about anything except the quotations which the gentleman had no right to include in his remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] moves to expunge the extraneous matter appearing in the remarks of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ZIONCHECK] on pages 2468 and 2469 of the daily Record.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

#### THE BLIZZARD OF 1936—VALUABLE SERVICE RENDERED DURING BLIZZARD BY RADIO STATION WJAG

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to pay tribute to a pioneer radio station which has been in continuous operation for 13 years in Nebraska and of which it can truly be said that in all of these years it has been operated in and for the general public service. The station about which I am today speaking is radio station WJAG, located at Norfolk, Nebr., in the Third Congressional District of Nebraska, which I have the honor to represent. This station is owned and operated by the Norfolk Daily News, the world's greatest country daily newspaper, of which Mr. Gene Huse is the publisher and owner.

My purpose for taking the floor today is to call attention of Members of the great service which this radio station has rendered and is continuing to render to mankind and in some way to pay my personal tribute to the owners of this great radio station for the service they are rendering to the people of my district.

I especially wish to tell you today of the unusual service rendered to the people of my district by this radio station during recent weeks when that part of Nebraska was in the grip of a terrible blizzard. For nearly 3 weeks my district has suffered from terribly cold weather. The mercury has been far below zero for 3 weeks. At one time, according to the Washington News, my home town, Norfolk, Nebr., re-

ported 40° below zero. There was danger of coal shortage; truck drivers were caught in the storm, and drivers on isolated roads were in many cases stalled and unable to proceed. There has been much suffering. Many were missing, but were found by the radio station, allaying the fears of relatives; livestock underwent great suffering; farmers on ranches were without word from the outside world for weeks; farm-to-market roads were blocked and are still blocked up to this time.

Norfolk is in the center of a rich agricultural country. It was known at one time to be in the center of the "richest 100-mile square in the world", agriculturally speaking. This part of Nebraska has never before last year suffered a complete crop failure. It had been settled by sturdy pioneers from Wisconsin, Illinois, and Virginia and other States—pioneers who turned those raw prairies into rich farms; pioneers who planted tree claims and brought forests and gardens to a prairie country. These pioneers went through all of the hardships of the early pioneer life. They fought Indians, prairie fires, locusts, and grasshoppers. They recall today the history blizzard of 1888. They knew lonely days and lonely nights, when there were no automobiles, no telephone, no telegraph, no newspapers or magazines, and no radio. Even today many of these farmers, who have been made practically penniless because of the drought, are without telephone, telegraph, or newspapers; but many of them, because of the hunger for word from the outside world, have radios. Those who are not so fortunate receive word from their more fortunate neighbors.

It is in this part of Nebraska that radio station WJAG, at Norfolk, Nebr., has rendered such magnificent public service during these past 13 years. It is to these people that this station daily transmits the news of the day; furnishes them with correct market news, weather reports, and storm warnings; and keeps in daily contact with communities, farms, and ranches, making life in isolated parts of the State happier.

Many storms have swept over Nebraska since the terrible blizzard of 1888. In those early days people never knew the results of those storms until many weeks later, when they read the account in such valuable newspapers as the Norfolk Daily News. But as radio entered the field and such public-service stations as pioneer radio station WJAG began broadcasting and enlightening the isolated rancher and farmer, people could by listening in secure advance information about the coming of the storms; they could bring livestock under protection; they could warn neighbors; they could send word to the country schoolhouses, where teachers could send their pupils home or give them protection. It is this public service which radio station WJAG has been rendering all of these years. It is to this kind of public service that owners and officials of this pioneer radio station have dedicated their efforts. And this is the kind of service which was so effectively done during the blizzard of 1936, to which I wish to call your attention today.

On Friday evening, February 7, 1936, a severe blizzard visited northeast Nebraska, accompanied by a heavy snow, a strong northwest wind, and subzero temperatures. The highways and most of the side roads—the farm-to-market roads—were drifted shut. Autoists were stranded, farms and towns were snowbound, trains could not move. Communities were without daily papers for many days and kept in touch with the outside world by radio. All business was paralyzed. Before the territory had recovered from the first storm another storm descended on Thursday evening, February 13, and there was additional snow on Friday evening, February 14; also on Saturday evening, February 15, and on Sunday evening, February 16.

The part played in the public service before, during, and after this "blizzard of 1936" by the pioneer radio station WJAG at Norfolk, Nebr., was a valuable one—one that is worthy to remember and a service which is worthy of space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The following brief report is given Members of the recent service rendered by this radio station:

Warnings of the storm were broadcast. Its progress was made known through reports from the Weather Bureau, Associated Press,

correspondents of the Norfolk Daily News, weather scouts to the West and Northwest, and phone calls from listeners.

Through the cooperation of the Nebraska State Highway Department district engineers in Norfolk, Ainsworth, and Lincoln, and patrolmen in various parts of the State, reports were made when roads were closed, when they were reopened. Some were opened and closed several times.

Frequent news broadcasts were made to keep listeners informed of international, national, State, and local events.

Many travelers who were stranded in farm homes without telephones were located for anxious relatives. In several instances farmers saddled horses and rode to the nearest telephone to report on the safety of travelers about whom appeals had been broadcast. Stranded travelers who could not reach relatives without telephones phoned the radio, and the messages were broadcast.

A letter was broadcast for a daughter whose mother had been snow-bound on a ranch without mail or telephone service for several weeks.

Travelers who stopped at farm homes for shelter report that almost invariably they found the family listening to WJAG's storm and news broadcasts. Listeners write of having the radio tuned to WJAG all day during the worst of the storm.

A minister stopped in the broadcast of his sermon to announce that three people lost for 2 days had been found. The director of the searching parties was stationed in a car with radio tuned to our station.

In several instances people for whom we were searching were listening to WJAG at the time of broadcast and immediately phoned to the station. In one case we were trying to locate a basketball team and the coach called before we had completed the broadcast to the relief of relatives of the boys and coach.

Employers broadcast orders to truck drivers to cancel or change routes. A snowbound State institution sent greetings to friends who could not reach it for a visitors' day. Schools, dances, picture shows, funerals, livestock sales, farm sales, and many other affairs were postponed by radio. Coal dealers quieted the fears of customers who feared a coal shortage. Stores closed early at night.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILCOX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by the attorneys of Halstead L. Ritter, a Federal judge, against whom impeachment charges have been filed. I ask unanimous consent to insert these remarks in the RECORD at this point without comment, for the reason that the charges against the judge were printed at length in the body of the RECORD at the time they were made. In fairness and in a spirit of fair play, I think this statement should be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, and I so request. It is a statement prepared by the attorneys for the judge. It is a short statement and should consume not more than a page of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Do I understand that according to the ruling just made on extensions of remarks, quotations from historical documents are precluded?

The SPEAKER. Any quotations that are not a part of the gentleman's own remarks.

Mr. O'MALLEY. They would have to be referred to in the request?

The SPEAKER. Yes; and specific authority must be obtained from the House before they may be inserted.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Does that even include poetry?

The SPEAKER. It includes everything.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, the shrewdest trickster is the one who parades under the camouflage of religion, pretending to give something for nothing. He desecrates eternal verities for the purpose of plying his trade. He drags down to the level of the racketeer the holy calling of the ministry. He stigmatizes the fervor and zeal of religious devotion by appealing to emotional instincts to entice converts to his cause. With subtlety he tempts the credulous and unthinking to a high mountain of prospect and promise, showing them his kingdoms of make-believe and assures them complete dominion in exchange for their allegiance. Reformers and charlatans are especially ambitious during

periods of financial distress. Proposers of panaceas of all kinds have shouted that they alone have the cure for all of our ills. The patent-medicine fakers have been exposed, the vendors of balms in Gilead have been banished, the hawkers of cure-alls at fairs and circuses have been discredited, but artful masqueraders barking their enticements of economic relief are still with us.

Assuming the role of righteous crusaders, adopting the melodies of sacred hymnals, conforming to the practice of supplication and prayer, a band of highly specialized promoters and salesmen is attempting to sell to the American people the Townsend plan as the means of relieving the financial distress of the Nation and as a method of assuring security for those of advanced years. The plan is unsound, unreasonable, unworkable, and ridiculous. It insults the intelligence of the American people and disdains the courage and the spirit of independence of men and women whose hearts are young and who still cherish the ambition of achievement, even though they are beyond the age of three score years. The plan has come into prominence not by reason of merit, but as a result of a well-organized and cunningly managed machine which secures its support from the unfortunate victims from whom it exacts contributions for the purposes of publicity programs, help-wanted advertisements, and the spread of propaganda. Solicitors, salesmen, sob-sisters, and supplicants constitute a personnel drawing salaries and commissions from the funds collected in this campaign of promised benefactions. But all of their arts and wiles have not as yet demonstrated how anyone is going to get anything for nothing. It simply cannot be done. And yet, boiled down and with all the frills removed, the plan is just that—to give people something for nothing—to relegate to the scrap heap those who reach a certain age; to discard as unfit and useless those, of whom many contribute more energy and initiative to real achievements than others only half their age; to throw aside the richness of experience and the maturity of judgment of those who in many walks of life command the most respect in their fields of activity; and in exchange for their relegation, this discarding of members of society to the scrap heap, this disdain of experience and judgment—yes; for this willingness to be put on the shelf, for this do-nothing attitude, for this limitation to rocking, nodding, and thumb twirling, as the only desirable activities of a group of men and women—each of them is to receive \$200 a month compensation.

The Townsend plan provides that citizens over the age of 60 years shall be paid a pension of \$200 per month for life. Husbands and wives will both be eligible so that they may receive a total of \$4,800 a year, subject to the condition that the recipients of these fantastic funds must give up all gainful pursuits and must spend the money within 30 days. In other words, the recipient must surrender his spirit of independence, his ambition to achieve, his sense of satisfaction which comes from individual endeavor. These he must dismiss and in their stead assume the role of a spendthrift. Idleness and profligacy are the conditions of eligibility. It is my firm conviction that neither of these have as yet been accepted by the American people as desirable traits of character. We have been proud of industry and scorned idleness. We have commended thrift and condemned profligacy. In spite of the spending spree indulged in by the present administration, the American people have not embraced the doctrine of salvation by spending. While those who are to receive the \$200 a month cannot give more than 15 percent to church or charity, they may spend it in any other way they see fit. The father of the movement, Dr. Townsend, appearing before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, indicated a rather flippant attitude toward the proposed beneficiaries of his plan as he sought to emphasize the latitude of the spending spree, when he said:

We do not care what he does with it. That is immaterial. Let him have carte blanche. Let him buy whisky with it if he wants to kill himself off as quickly as he chooses. That is immaterial. It is commerce—business—that we want in the country. We are not going to regulate people's morals in the least when we give them money to spend.

It is evident from this statement by Dr. Townsend that neither the welfare of the aged nor the security of those in advanced years is the chief concern of the planners. The hymn singing—supplicating—exhorting role of a salvationist is discarded and the true purpose of these crusaders appears—"Give them money to spend." It is the same inducement as the one used by the charlatan at the county fair vending his elixir of life—something for nothing. And added to it is the fallacious doctrine that the more we spend the wealthier we become. It would appear that the Townsendites have conceived a twentieth-century version of the story of the prodigal son and have substituted for the errant young man of that famous story a new character. Instead of one in his teens as tempted to profligacy, they suggest a man or a woman 60 years of age or more, going not to father but to dear old Uncle Sam, demanding of him a monthly stipend of \$200, and giving to this generous relative the solemn assurance to dissipate his fortune in monthly installments as expeditiously as possible. Consistency might even suggest the necessity of changing the lines of the old revival song to "Oh, where is my dad tonight?"

Everyone will admit that some estimate should be made of the number of possible recipients of this fantastic bounty and what the cost will be for this excursion on the part of our elders into the fields of prodigality, squandering, and dissipation. It is reasonable to assume from available census figures that there would be at this time 10,000,000 persons eligible to receive the benefits of the Townsend plan. At \$2,400 a year this would mean payments in bounties alone of \$24,000,000,000 a year. What the added cost of administration would be is difficult to imagine; for while the plan provides that certain of the pensioners are to be selected as administrators, it can be seen readily that requiring service from some of the beneficiaries while others are disporting themselves in their spending sprees would soon cause serious consequences. Nor can one fail to see the incidental costs involved in the stupendous tax collecting which the Townsendites propose as the method of providing the revenue for this wild orgy of spending. But aside from administrative expenses and incidental costs, \$24,000,000,000 a year startles even a most courageous man. The contemplation to a more timid soul might be fatal. Twenty-four billion dollars represents practically one-half of the produced income of the Nation. It represents about eight times the revenue of the Federal Government for 1934 from taxation and miscellaneous receipts. It represents about three times the total value of all the farm products of the country in 1935. It represents five times the amount of the much criticized relief measure passed by Congress in 1935. It represents nearly the total debt of the Federal Government after almost 150 years of its existence. It represents more than two times the total amount of Federal appropriations in 1935 for all Federal establishments and projects, including the very generous public-works program, the Army, the Navy, and all other activities dipping into the Federal Treasury. It staggers a sensible man to think about it.

To meet the cost of this tremendous outlay the proponents of the plan propose a transaction tax of 2 percent. Despite the efforts of the Townsendites to minimize the additional load of such a tax by suggesting that it would be no great burden on anybody, any sensible man knows that the additional load would be unbearable. Every dollar of tax paid means a dollar less for family needs. The transaction tax would fall directly on the consumer, and its exactions would weigh most heavily on the wage earner, the laborer, and the lower-salaried employees in the Nation whose incomes are spent almost entirely for the maintenance of the family, and whose purchases would be affected seriously by the payment of 2 percent on every transaction in which they engage. The increased costs of commodities, including food, wearing apparel, and all the other necessities of life, can be imagined as we contemplate the pyramiding of this 2-percent tax. In each of the successive steps as commodities come from the producer to the ultimate consumer the 2 percent would be added. And there would be only one way for this additional cost to be paid, and that would be by increasing the cost of commodities to the consumer. The

tax proposal would inflict a hardship on the poor which would be heartless. Every loaf of bread, every quart of milk, every bushel of potatoes, every article of clothing would have added to its cost this pyramided tax burden of 2 percent for each transaction involved from the original source of the product or raw material down to its ultimate purchase by the consumer. From the grain fields of the West, where the wheat is grown, down to the purchase of a loaf of bread at the corner store involves transaction after transaction. Each would have 2 percent added.

The contemplation of the increase in cost of such an article of foodstuff should alarm even a zealous Townsendite. And what applies to a loaf of bread applies with equal force to all other necessities of life.

Apparently no serious attention has been given to the task of collecting this pyramided tax burden. The bookkeeping involved would require the drafting of an army of accountants. Efforts to evade the tax would mean the employment of thousands of inspectors and snoopers, and into every mart and place of trade this swarm of Federal agents would operate, seeking whom it might devour. Business and industry would be so busy keeping records and computing taxes that no energy would be left to produce goods.

All thinking men have been concerned with the problem of increasing taxation. Governmental costs have grown tremendously. These costs must be borne by the people. It is estimated that the present per-capita tax is \$122 on every man, woman, and child in the country. The Townsend donation of \$24,000,000,000 would be a tax of \$190 per year on every citizen, or an increase of the tax burden on every man, woman, and child in the land from \$122 to \$312 per year. Our social system could not bear the load of this additional burden. It would mean ruination and collapse.

The common sense of the American people still prevails. Waves of hysteria and emotionalism may carry some people into movements which are unsound and impractical, but the great majority of the citizens will not be persuaded by the fanaticism of economic quacks. This wave of hysteria will abate, but unfortunately not until many people will have been duped into making contributions for the salaries of the promoters. Every effort should be made to bring to the attention of our people the fallacy of this fanatical crusade and save them the cost of maintaining this juggernaut of foolishness.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a report from the Treasury Department as of February 15, 1936.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. STELL. Reserving the right to object, how long are these reports?

Mr. KRAMER. About three typewritten pages. To be correct, it is two and one-third pages.

Mr. RICH. What do the reports deal with?

Mr. KRAMER. They deal with deposits in the banks and in the Treasury, showing them to be the greatest in our history. The gentleman continuously asks, "Where are you going to get the money?"

Mr. RICH. We get this information through the daily press.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

#### CONSERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 3780) to promote the conservation and profitable use of agricultural land resources by temporary Federal aid to farmers and by providing for a permanent policy of Federal aid to States for such purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 3780, with Mr. FULLER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. For the information of the Committee, the Chair will state the parliamentary situation. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has introduced an amendment known as the House bill as a substitute for the Senate bill. There can be pending but one amendment to the substitute. Several amendments have been suggested, and it is expected that all of them will be considered.

The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, which, if there be no objection, the Clerk will again read for the information of the Committee.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McCORMACK offered the following amendment to the substitute: On page 2, strike out lines 7 and 8 and insert the following: "(5) reestablishment, at as rapid a rate as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be practicable and in general public interest, of the ratio between the purchasing power of the net income per person on farms and that of the income per person not on farms that prevailed during the 5-year period 1910-14, inclusive, as determined from statistics available in the United States Department of Agriculture, and the maintenance of such ratio. The powers conferred under sections 7 to 14, inclusive, of this act shall be used to assist voluntary action calculated to effectuate the purposes specified in this section. Such powers shall not be used to discourage the production of supplies of foods and fibers sufficient to maintain normal domestic human consumption as determined by the Secretary from the records of domestic human consumption in the years 1920 to 1929, inclusive, taking into consideration increased population, quantities of any commodity that were forced into domestic consumption by decline in exports during such period, current trends in domestic consumption and exports of particular commodities, and the quantities of substitutes available for domestic consumption within any general class of food commodities."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is very simple; and if the amendment is adopted, it is my intention to vote for this bill, because the amendment will, under existing circumstances, tend to afford protection to the consumers of the country.

Like my friend from New York [Mr. BOYLAN], who spoke for the farmers of Manhattan yesterday, for the viewpoint of the consumer, I, too, represent a district that has not a farm in it. I represent, however, a district whose people appreciate the position of the great farm population of this country, who recognize that it is for the benefit of all to improve the condition of the 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 people affected, who were economically depressed even before the depression, over a period of approximately 15 years; a people who during that time have not been able to sell the product of the farm at even cost of production, let alone at a fair return. My people recognize that this has a serious effect upon the welfare of the worker, has a serious effect upon the factory and the businessman of every district who sell their products to the great farming sections of our country.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield in order that I may make a brief statement?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I realize that in any program of this kind the consumer must be taken into consideration. Those who have studied this question realize that it is an interrelated problem, and that any program in America must be a fair one.

An amendment almost identical with the McCormack amendment was prepared by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN]. I talked with both these gentlemen about it and with other Members. They have been generous enough to include in the first part of the amendment a provision that I think makes it fair to the farm population as well as to the city population; and it is my personal desire that the House accept the amendment. As far as I am concerned I am willing that it be accepted. [Applause.]

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I notice the amendment refers to the income per person on farms prevailing during the period from 1910 to 1914. It also refers to the income of people not on farms during the same period. My fear is that the

amendment does not properly include the item of investment. Farmers undoubtedly have large investments in their farms. They have perhaps \$10,000, \$25,000, or \$50,000 of investments. A great many of them pay taxes and interest; but even if they do not, it seems to me some thought ought to be paid to the proposition of allowing the farmer an income on his investment. I wonder what this amendment does with regard to that, and I propound this question to the gentleman from Massachusetts and to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. JONES. Replying to the gentleman from Iowa, I may say that the amendment affects equally the investment of those on farms or those not on farms. It refers to the net income of the farm. The gentleman will remember that in all the farm bills that have been given serious consideration in the House the years from 1910 to 1914, inclusive, have formed the base period in each instance.

Mr. GILCHRIST. That was upon the theory that there should be parity of prices.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JONES. The pre-war period is a better period for the farmer than any other period.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I understand that; but instead of proceeding on the theory of parity of prices which has heretofore been a fundamental theory in these bills, it proceeds on the theory of parity of income.

Mr. JONES. That is better treatment for the farmer, so we are well within the range of adequate treatment for the farmer.

Mr. GILCHRIST. But the thing that troubles me is how the question of farm investment is affected by the McCormack amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. The amendment is not predicated upon investment, it is predicated upon wages. The worker gets his wages. His capital investment is his labor. It seems to me that this is fair to both. At the present time, as I understand it, the estimates are that the per-capita farm income of 1935 had a purchasing power equal to 83 percent of the pre-war farm income, and that the per-capita income of nonfarm people had a purchasing power of about 90 percent.

Mr. JONES. It is the ratio, not the net income.

Mr. McCORMACK. I feel this amendment is fair.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. This amendment, it seems to me, should be acceptable to the farmers of the country, because it goes even further than the A. A. A., in that it puts a limit on parity income, whereas the A. A. A. had an effect only on parity prices.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct. In a desire to be honest and as fair as we can, and recognizing that if we protect the consumers the situation might be unsettled with reference to the farmers without the parity provision, we have prepared this amendment to try to extend as great a degree of justice to all groups of citizens as we can. The gentleman has expressed a fear on the part of the farmers. The chairman of the Agricultural Committee has accepted this amendment, and I hope the Committee of the Whole will also accept it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman's amendment provides for the period 1910 to 1914, inclusive. My understanding is that in all agricultural legislation heretofore enacted the period included has been the years 1909 to 1913. I am wondering if there would be any objection to correcting the gentleman's amendment to include the years 1909 to 1913, inclusive, because the worst agricultural year we ever had was the year 1914, the year war was declared. The gentleman's amendment would include the year 1914.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman will take the period included in this amendment he will find it is better for the farmer.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is, if it includes the years 1909 to 1913, inclusive. If you take the calendar year 1914, as this amendment does, it is not fair to the farmer, because the year 1914 was the worst year the farmers ever had, and especially for cotton farmers. It was the year of the buy-a-bale movement.

Mr. JONES. The calendar year 1914 index is 100 and the index under this amendment is 101, which is better for the farmer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. In further explanation of the amendment and its purposes, I offered it to section 7 to provide that the powers conferred by the act shall not be used to reduce supplies of food and fibers for domestic consumption below the normal quantities we have been consuming in recent years. That section of the bill now provides for maintenance of an adequate supply at prices fair to producers and consumers. I agree with the intent of that provision, but it is indefinite. It sets up no standard to guarantee consumers against scarcity of food supplies.

The amendment I offer gives the consumer a definite assurance that, so far as the operation of the act is concerned, there will be no reduction of supplies below normal requirements. It designates the 10-year period 1920 to 1929 as the basis upon which normal requirements are to be determined. It sets up the average per-capita consumption of foods and fibers in that period as a minimum standard below which the supply shall not be reduced by the operation of any of the powers conferred under the act.

That 10-year period gives a fair measure of normal consumption. It contains years of prosperity and it avoids the reduced supplies of the last 2 years resulting from the severe drought. As a matter of fact the average per-capita consumption of all foods in this country does not vary by any large amount from one period to the next if we leave out unusual conditions such as the drought. A preliminary report on the subject published last year by the Department of Agriculture showed that the average person consumed 1,422 pounds of food in the 5 years 1920 to 1924, 1,474 pounds in 1925 to 1929, and 1,454 pounds in 1930 to 1933. For the 14 years 1920 to 1933 the average consumption per capita was 1,450 pounds, and during the 10 years specified in my amendment it was at practically the same figure.

It may be said that farmers were not producing our food supplies under favorable conditions during those years. I do not dispute that, and there is a provision in the amendment that gives consideration to that side of the picture. But the consumer protection feature of this amendment does not tie the farmer down to the same income status that he had in those 10 years. It does not require him to duplicate the production of those years in all crops. It does not compel him to produce for export markets that have been greatly restricted, and it does not require him to keep adding to the burdensome carry-over of agricultural products year after year.

As I understand the program of soil conservation contemplated in this bill, it aims to guarantee food supplies for the future through conserving the fertility of the soil from which that future supply must come. But I do not understand that in order to do that we must now reduce the consumption of food and get along with less than we have been eating. I

do not believe that anyone will say that from a physical standpoint our farm areas are unable to produce the food we need and at the same time use the land in such manner as will not destroy its usefulness to future generations.

Nor do I think it will be said that the normal consumption of food in this country has been too great. What we all look forward to is a better standard of living. Our capacity to consume is greater than what we have consumed in the past, and that includes foodstuffs as well as industrial products, although the maximum possible increase in food consumption is probably much less than in the case of industrial products. The Brookings Institution report on our capacity to consume estimated that food consumption would be increased 20 percent, if all low-income families were raised to a level of \$2,500 a year. When we can have real prosperity in this country reaching down to all income levels, that larger consumption is what we will want and is what the farmer will want to produce for us, because we will then be able to pay him a living wage for producing that larger quantity.

The amendment also provides a goal for agriculture in terms of the relation of farmers' purchasing power to the purchasing power of the nonfarm population. For that purpose the base period specified is 1910 to 1914, a period in which the relation of farm to nonfarm purchasing power was higher than in any years since then, with the exception of about 3 years during the war period, when agriculture's income was suddenly lifted far above its level in the years before or since.

The records show that during the post-war period of prosperity farmers did not share equally in the increase of national income that took place during those years. When the depression came the farmers' share dropped more than that of the nonfarm population, and has not yet come back to where it was in the pre-war period. The purpose of this part of the amendment is to set up as a goal for agriculture an equal participation in the greater national income which the return of prosperity is going to give us.

In precise terms it states that the goal is to restore to its 1910-14 level the ratio between the purchasing power of the average income per person on farms to the purchasing power of the average income per person in the nonfarm population. Estimates are that the per-capita farm income in 1935 had a purchasing power equal to 83 percent of the pre-war farm income, and that per-capita nonfarm income had a purchasing power of about 93 percent of pre-war. By dividing the latter figure into the former we get the result that, according to the standard established by the amendment, farmers' income in 1935 was 90 percent of pre-war parity.

The amendment contains both of these goals. It includes the return toward parity of farmers' income as one of the purposes of the act, and it gives the assurance to consumers that in carrying out these purposes the powers given to the Secretary shall not be used to bring about a reduction of supplies for domestic consumption below normal. It provides that the Secretary shall determine what those normal levels are by examining the records of domestic consumption for foods and fibers in the 1920-29 period and gives him some necessary latitude in making that determination.

For example, allowance must be made for increased population since those years. The estimated population in 1936 is about 12 percent larger than it was in 1925. Normal supplies for this year will be correspondingly larger than normal requirements in the earlier years. Furthermore, there are trends and shifts in the consumption of different classes of foods that have been taking place over a period of years. Consumption of potatoes, cereal products, and even meats has been going down, according to the records now available, while consumption of eggs, fruits, and vegetables and dairy products has been increasing. The Secretary may allow for these major shifts in consumption habits in determining normal supplies for the present or the future.

The Secretary is also authorized by the amendment to make allowance for the quantities of substitutes available in any general class of foods. For instance, if more than normal supplies of one kind of meat is in prospect, that factor

may be taken into account in determining minimum requirements for all kinds of meat products taken together.

Finally there is a provision that allowance may be made for the fact that domestic consumption during the 10 years 1920-29 was increased beyond actual normal levels by the decline in exports which took place in the case of some commodities during that period. As a practical matter, this applies only to hog products. I am told that the average yearly per-capita consumption of pork and lard increased from 74 pounds in the years before the war to 84 pounds in the years 1925-29. Some part of this increase, but not all of it, obviously resulted from the fact that the wartime demand and war prices had stimulated a great increase in hog production. This increase continued until 1924, and after that year hog production did not fall off, although exports of pork and lard dropped very considerably after 1919, and from 1924 on continued to decline down to the present abnormally low levels.

To the extent that part of the increased consumption of pork products during the 1920-29 period can be shown to have resulted from these abnormal war and post-war conditions, an adjustment can be made in determining our present normal domestic requirements for hog products.

Taking these factors which are specified in the amendment into consideration, the Secretary of Agriculture can readily determine what normal consumer requirements are, and the powers of the act cannot be used to discourage the production of such supplies as are sufficient to maintain at least that normal consumption. This is not primarily a production-control act, but unless it is administered with consumer requirements in view as well as the principles of soil conservation, the consuming public could rightly fear that a scarcity of food supplies might be the result. It is probably not the intention of the farm advocates of this measure to say that the farm industry is unable or unwilling to provide consumers with these normal requirements of foods and fibers. It is the production of quantities in excess of those requirements and in excess of what can be sold at profitable figures in the export market that is depriving the farmer of a return to a decent standard of living.

I understand the Secretary of Agriculture has approved this amendment. The report of the National Agricultural Conference in Washington on the 18th of January recommended that the new legislation should contain provisions "safeguarding consumer welfare against extending adjustment into scarcity."

City consumers recognize the fact that their own welfare is tied up with the welfare of farmers. On the other hand, I think that farmers recognize that a farm program will not long continue to improve conditions on the farm if it operates to create a scarcity of food supplies in the cities. The amendment I propose takes into account both the farmers' objective of a more equitable share in the national income and the consumers' necessity in terms of normal supplies of farm products.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, may I take time enough to call attention to the fact that the amendment presented by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is the same as my amendment? May I say that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture is indeed generous, as he always is? He is fair. With the adoption of this amendment I will be very glad, on behalf of the consumers of the United States, and particularly of the great city of New York, to vote for this bill.

I am one of those who believes that no man can live alone. We are interdependent upon one another. We need the farmers of this country and we need the dwellers of the great cities. Destroy the cities of America and the farms would be but wildernesses. The farms need the cities and the cities need the farms. We are going along in a spirit of mutual helpfulness, and I am sure the adoption of this amendment, which has been approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, will give to the consumers of America a fair break. It will also give the farmers a fair price for their commodities. It will enable the farmers to get money with

which to buy manufactured articles needed by them, yet prevent a rise in the price of farm products beyond the point where the residents of the cities or the nonfarmer will be able to buy them. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Agricultural Committee for his acquiescence and acceptance of the amendment and trust that it will be adopted by this Committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to seek information with respect to the amendment. I, too, am one of those who not only believes but knows that the laborers and the artisans, as well as all the businessmen, of this country must have prosperity. I have voted for every one of the labor bills that has been proposed in this Congress since becoming a Member. I want to go along with labor and with industry. Agriculture itself is interested in seeing to it that consumers are given a fair deal and that prices are not too high. I am not now rising to object to this amendment so much as I am to have it clarified.

I do not understand the amendment. I notice, for example, the words "net income" are put in there with reference to the farmers and only "income" with reference to those off of the farms. I think that makes for the benefit of the farmer, but I wonder whether it dare appear in the Record if it was so intended. Coming from a farm district, I think it is perhaps to our advantage to have it remain as now written.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman understands, of course, that the major portion of the city dweller's income is on a salary basis?

Mr. GILCHRIST. This involves the laborers of this country, and I want every laborer to be paid full wages and every consumer to have fair prices. I join with the gentleman from New York, who just left the floor. You will observe that I have gone along with him whenever I could vote for his laborers and home owners and his consumers in New York City or elsewhere; but the thing I want to know now is how this affects the investments of the farmers. The farmers have an investment in addition to their labor. The gentleman from New York said that the laborers work. So do the farmers. They work more hours to the day and more days to the year than does any other class or group of men.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I do not see why it should not be corrected on that basis.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that in the amendment which I have offered the words "net income" may appear in that portion of the amendment relating to the nonfarm population. I think it should apply to both. This was an oversight, and I am glad the gentleman called it to my attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman wishes to modify his amendment to the extent indicated?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I think I had better object. I do not believe we should agree to that without going into the matter further.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the chairman of the Agricultural Committee explain, if he will, how this amendment is going to affect the capital investments of the farmers or the income from their capital investments, aside from the income derived from their labor. That is the reason I took this time.

Mr. JONES. I do not know that I can give the gentleman a yardstick on that, but this refers to the net income of the farmers, and I think there is a generally understood meaning of what net income is. Of course, this takes into consideration, I assume, what his expenses are in connection with his income, and I may state that a great many who represent city districts have agreed to this, and this is practically their own language insofar as that portion of the amendment is concerned.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I do not object to the payment of the boys in the cities. I have always been for that, and am now; but is a farmer going to be allowed any income for his investment when the comparison is made?

Mr. JONES. I am sure he would be, because this is "net income", and, of course, that factor would have to be considered.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. I move to strike out the figures "1910-14", inclusive, where they occur, and insert in lieu thereof "August 1909-July 1914, inclusive."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I think that would make very little difference, and if there is any contention about it, I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This is the language of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. The base period for all commodities except tobacco was the pre-war period, August 1, 1909, to July 31, 1914. In the case of tobacco the post-war period was utilized, and the period from August 1919 to July 1929 was used in the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

I think the amendment proposed by me is material and important. By the adoption of my amendment, the cotton crop year 1914 would not be embraced. The crop years would be 1909 to 1913, inclusive. It will be remembered that the price of the 1914 cotton crop was exceedingly low. There was an unprecedented decline in the market following the beginning of the World War. The "buy a bale" movement obtained. I am glad to know that my amendment is satisfactory to the chairman as well as to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks I take occasion to say that I favor the pending bill, H. R. 10835. I advocate its substitution for Senate bill 3780.

#### SUBSTITUTE

Those who oppose Federal legislation in behalf of agriculture roll as a sweet morsel under their tongues the criticism of the pending measure that it is evasive and hypocritical. It is asserted that the purpose is to aid agriculture under the exercise of the admitted constitutional right to conserve and rebuild the soil, and thus protect the resources of the Nation. Well, what of it? Certainly the preservation of the soil and the economic use of land should result in benefits to the farmers of the Nation. Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones. Under the guise of a high protective tariff, ostensibly to collect revenue but in reality to protect, the American market is reserved to the American manufacturer, and in agricultural commodities not on expert basis to the American grower. If the taxing power of the Nation can be used to protect the manufacturer, surely the power of the country to provide for the general welfare and to conserve our national resources can be used to aid agriculture.

#### NATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

There are 360,000,000 acres of cultivated lands in the United States. The Department of Agriculture in 1934 estimated that 50,000,000 acres of farm land had been destroyed because the soil had been washed away; that another 50,000,000 acres were in almost an equally bad condition, and that an additional 100,000,000 acres of land had been seriously impaired by erosion. The kind of farming which produces big surpluses is bad farming; it destroys the soil and it creates deficits, but the destruction of the soil is the destruction of the basic capital resource of the Nation. Crops have been planted that are exhausting the land. The general welfare of the American people is bound up with the preservation of their natural resources. The proposition is indisputable. The pending bill proposes to reinvest \$500,000,000 a year in the preservation of the patrimony of the Nation. National saving will result.

During the World War the Federal Government urged production. The Federal Government stimulated production. It was not satisfied for the States alone to look after agriculture. The cultivation of wheat expanded from 50,000,000 acres to 75,000,000 acres. There were other expansions; in fact, the Government, from 1862 to 1920, stimulated pro-

duction. No one ever questioned the power of the Government to stimulate production; but now that there has been overproduction, it is said that the Government cannot aid, in the general interest, in a well-balanced production. The Supreme Court has declared the Agricultural Adjustment Act void. The best approach to the problem has been through the expansion of the Government program of soil conservation.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act did benefit agriculture. The farm cash income increased from \$4,400,000,000 in 1932 to \$6,900,000,000 in 1935. This increase came about not only as a result of the subsidies under the Agricultural Adjustment Act but because of the recovery of the country. The factors of supply and demand have had their effect.

Under the decision of the Supreme Court in the Butler case, a Federal statutory plan to regulate and control agricultural production is invalid. Although stimulated and encouraged for 75 years by the Federal Government by a well-directed high-powered public opinion, production was increased; yet the Supreme Court has now declared that only the States have the inherent power to control production of agricultural products. The pending bill undertakes to provide for State aid and coordination of State plans to preserve and promote the economic use and conservation of soil and natural soil resources.

#### BENEFITS

If the Federal Government was warranted during the World War in encouraging farmers to cultivate lands that should never have been planted to produce wheat and cotton for the Allies; if the Federal Government was justified in encouraging the destruction of our soil to supply a European demand which has now disappeared, surely the Federal Government should encourage the return of that land to grass and trees. Nothing would so greatly promote the general welfare.

Any plan to provide for rebuilding the soil must contemplate cash payments. The farmers must buy in a protected market and sell in a world market. They are unable to rebuild their lands without aid. They ask nothing more nor less than the moral, economic, and political equivalent of the advantages enjoyed by industry through the protective tariff.

High tariff walls have resulted in the loss of foreign markets. This has been particularly true in the case of cotton. For the period 1925-29 cotton constituted 65 percent of America's contribution to world trade. For the period 1929-35 the percentage had decreased to 49 percent.

I oppose the doctrine of scarcity, but farmers must be sane in their production. It is suicidal to produce crops that are not needed. Moreover, since the adoption of the Tariff Act of 1922 and the Tariff Act of 1932 the United States has imported more foods than it has exported.

The passage of the pending bill will result in rebuilding the soil of the Nation. Winds and water have destroyed much of the soil. Grasses and legumes will restore this soil. At the same time payments may be made to the farmers, including the tenants and sharecroppers, as they were made under the Agricultural Adjustment Act. The rentals and the benefits will be determined by the fertility and productivity of the soil, and in order to promote and restore foreign markets subsidies and allotments are permitted. Subsidies alone would not be sufficient. The demand must be increased. Trade at home and abroad must be promoted.

#### THE PLAN

The plan provides for grants by the Federal Government to the States, which in turn will aid farmers in soil conservation. Inasmuch as some time will elapse before a sufficient number of States can enact laws to take advantage of Federal aid, a temporary program is provided. Conditional noncoercive payments for the years 1936 and 1937 are authorized to farmers to encourage proper utilization of their soil. After that the aid will be administered by the States under plans to be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. These plans must show there is coordination among the States. In order to comply with the Butler case, the Secretary is denied the

power to make contracts, but, inasmuch as the Supreme Court did not forbid additional expenditures to promote the general welfare, the bill authorizes payments upon farmers complying with certain conditions. It is expected, therefore, that the farmers will receive the substantial benefits under the pending bill that accrued to them under the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

#### NO TAX ON PRODUCTION

The Bankhead bill has been repealed. There is no provision in the pending bill comparable to the so-called Bankhead Cotton Control Act. There will be no tax upon production on acres cultivated. The criticism, especially by the small grower, of the Bankhead Act does not obtain in the pending bill; moreover, sharecroppers and tenants, as was the case under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, will participate in the benefits and cash payments.

Under the temporary plan each producer is completely free to do as he pleases with his farm. He need not accept payments. He may decline to adopt any practice. The temporary plan for 1936 and 1937 is voluntary. The Secretary of Agriculture is expressly forbidden from entering into any binding contract with any producer. The Federal power under the temporary plan is wholly within the Constitution under the Butler decision.

#### THE STATES

The bill provides that no payments shall be made after the years 1936 and 1937 to individual growers. It is necessary for the States, therefore, vested with the power to control and regulate production, to pass laws to carry out the purposes of the Federal aid authorized after the temporary period of 2 years has elapsed. The plan will be executed by the States by agencies approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. Moreover, the National and Federal interests will be conserved by grants or aids to the States being subject to the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. The dual form of government is recognized. The State is the agency to control, but the Federal Government will be the agency to coordinate so that the control and the stable production may be effective.

#### ALLOTMENTS TO ASSOCIATIONS

The pending bill is a substitute for the Senate bill. The Senate adopted the so-called La Follette amendment authorizing the Secretary to enter into contracts with associations as defined in the Capper-Volstead Act. This amendment has no place in the pending bill. I am opposed to it. I am especially opposed to the provisions of the Senate bill that authorizes the use of the moneys appropriated for the stabilization of the markets. This is nothing more or less than the resurrection of the Federal Farm Board and its fatal attempts to stabilize markets; moreover, under the terms of the so-called La Follette amendment payments intended for growers could be diverted to associations, and thus the main purpose of the legislation would be thwarted.

#### LANDLORDS AND TENANTS

The suggestion has been made that a maximum of say \$2,000 be the largest amount that may be paid to any one grower. It is said that such a limitation would be for the benefit of the small farmers and the tenants. I speak especially with respect to cotton. There must be equality in all benefit payments to landlord and tenants. For the same type of soil similar payments will be made to the large owner and to the small owner. The landlords, whether large or small, will share on the same basis, but a limitation of the total amount that may be paid on any one farm would be inimicable and unjust to the tenants. The larger the farm the greater the number of tenants. If the landlord were not to receive a reasonable cash payment, he would decline to cooperate. The result would be the tenants on the larger plantations would receive no benefits at all. Instead of a limitation, therefore, upon the payments to any one farm being for the benefit of the tenants, there would be the rankest sort of discrimination against the tenant and the sharecropper. At the same time there would be no corresponding benefit to the small producer. Producers only ask equality. They do not expect nor will they tolerate discriminations.

#### DAIRYING

I believe in a well-balanced agriculture. All farmers should participate. Dairying is an important industry. There should be no discrimination against dairying. I believe that the Representatives from the dairying industry are unduly alarmed. I know of no way to judge the future except by the past. Dairying has received fair treatment during the existence of the Agricultural Adjustment Act; moreover, dairying is an agricultural industry that is protected by the tariff. The case is not comparable with the cotton situation. It is not comparable with other agricultural products produced for export. Since 1920 the United States has been on a net import basis for dairy products. These products are produced primarily for domestic consumption. They are protected in the home market. Cotton is forced to sell at world competitive prices.

In April 1925 the tariff level per pound on butter was raised from 8 cents to 12 cents. It was increased to 14 cents in January 1929. On January 24, 1936, New Zealand butter on the London market was selling at the equivalent of 20.4 cents per pound, while the New York market was 35 cents per pound. The difference was slightly greater than the 14-cent import duty. Now, the cotton growers do not begrudge the tariff to the butter farmers, but they believe that they themselves are entitled to the equivalent benefits.

In 1934 the gross income from dairy products was 61 percent of the 1929 gross income, while the gross income of cotton and seed was only 52 percent of the gross income in 1929.

In 1933 the gross income from dairy products was 54.4 percent of the 1929 gross income, while in the case of cotton and seed it was 49.5 percent.

It is therefore apparent that because of preferential treatment under the tariff, as well as from other benefits, the producers of dairy products during the depression suffered a smaller loss of income than did producers of cotton and cottonseed. During the years 1933 and 1934 the dairy farmers received a relatively larger income than did the cotton growers.

Something has been said about the treaty with Canada. Butter was not included in the treaty and the tariff on Cheddar cheese was only reduced from 7 to 5 cents per pound, and cream—not over 1,500,000 gallons annually—was reduced from 56.6 cents to 35 cents per gallon. Dairy products are still well protected by the tariff.

#### DAIRY AMENDMENT

There is no occasion for the dairy amendment. In definite terms it undertakes to control production. This is specifically condemned in the Butler case. Only the States are vested with the power of control. Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act no mention was made of the crops that might be planted on rented acres. I repeat this statement to emphasize it. There was no limitation in the act itself respecting the crops to be grown on cotton, wheat, or corn lands. However, in the so-called Bankhead Control Act the only mention of competitive production occurs. Section 6 of this act, and I quote:

Prevents expansion on lands leased by the Government of competitive production by such producer of agricultural commodities other than cotton.

Prior to the passage of the Bankhead Act commercial or competitive crops were not grown under the 1933 program; moreover, in the administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act the Secretary of Agriculture stipulated that the rented acres of land should not be used for competitive purposes.

If the Secretary of Agriculture has protected the dairy industry by payments conditioned that no competitive uses shall be made of rented acres under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, surely he can be depended upon to insert similar conditions under the temporary plan of the pending bill. The cotton growers do not expect to grow commercial and competitive crops on lands planted to legumes or to other soil-building crops. They do not want to be penalized; they do not want the program endangered by a stipulation that

would give the Secretary power over production when such a power can only be exercised by the States.

The lands are to be planted to cover crops that are not to be commercially disposed of. The crops will not be competitive. The authority given to the Secretary of Agriculture to make rules and regulations upon which he may condition the grants or payments amply protect the dairy farmers of the Nation. Their fears are unfounded; their apprehensions are unwarranted. No such provision as the dairy or Boileau amendment obtained, I repeat, in the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and the language respecting competitive production in the Bankhead Control Act, passed a year after the Agricultural Adjustment Act was approved, merely approved the plan that had been previously promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The cotton growers have cooperated with the dairy growers. They concede high tariffs to dairy products. I urge my friends from the dairying States of the Union to continue their cooperation for a well-balanced program to solve the agricultural problem of the Nation. Of course, large cotton crops mean cheap crops. In expecting cheap feed crops, the dairy industry would be selfish. All agriculture should prosper together.

I conclude by saying that we will continue to have the farm problem as long as we maintain the tariff at its present level, for the tariff discriminates against the farmer and fosters monopoly. Equivalent benefits to farmers have come to stay until high tariffs to protected industries have been eliminated. I maintain that a tariff should be for all or for none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: In line 6 of the proposed amendment, strike out "1910-1914" and insert "August 1909-July 1914."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, insofar as I am concerned, I am in favor of the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 5, line 5, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "Provided, however, That apportionments of funds available for carrying out the purposes specified in this section for the year 1936 may be made at any time during 1936, and apportionments for 1937 may be made at any time during 1937. Notwithstanding the making of an apportionment to any State for any calendar year, any amount so apportioned which is not required to carry out an approved plan for such State for such year shall be available for carrying out the provisions of sections 7 to 14, inclusive, of this act."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this simply provides that a State plan may be put into effect at once and reserves the balance for the purposes provided in the act.

Mr. CLAIBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking the distinguished chairman of the committee a question.

Do I understand correctly that when the Senate bill was pending Senator LA FOLLETTE offered and the Senate accepted an amendment to the effect that the Government is to handle any commodities it owns or may own through the Farmers' National Grain Corporation and not through the grain dealers of the different exchanges throughout the country?

Mr. JONES. That is not exactly the amendment. That amendment, I understand, will be offered, and I hope the gentleman will wait until it is offered, when we will go into that. I have some corrective amendments I want to offer.

There is an amendment which the Senate adopted, which authorizes certain things to be done by cooperatives, but it does not do exactly what the gentleman states, and I would rather not undertake to speak on that amendment at this time.

Mr. CLAIBORNE. We will take that up later?

Mr. JONES. If the amendment is offered; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. JONES: Page 8, line 13, after "by", insert "striking out clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof '(3) reestablish farmers' purchasing power by making payments in connection with the normal production of any agricultural commodity for domestic consumption. Determinations by the Secretary as to what constitutes diversion and what constitutes normal channels of trade and commerce and what constitutes normal production for domestic consumption shall be final, and by"; and on page 8, line 19, strike out "best effectuate" and insert "effectuate substantial accomplishment of any one or more of."

Mr. JONES. This was a provision in section 32, clause 3, under the old adjustment program, and this amendment makes the sums which were available for adjustments in production available for a domestic allotment plan under this program.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Just where is that?

Mr. JONES. Page 8, line 13. The bill used the language "best effectuate", and that made it difficult to administer because it would make it necessary to find the particular plan that would best effectuate the purposes.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. I wish the gentleman would explain in simple language just what he intends to do by this amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And may I add to that question, so that the gentleman can answer both—will he state what this has to do with conservation and erosion?

Mr. JONES. It has nothing whatever to do with conservation or erosion. The gentleman will recall that, wholly disconnected from the agricultural adjustment program as such, there was a fund set aside of 30 percent of the customs receipts. This amendment simply makes some of the money available for a domestic allotment plan applicable under this act.

In addition it provided that the three powers should be used in such a way as to "best effectuate", and in doing that it was found that they had to go through a lot to determine which was best. This substitutes for "best effectuate" the words "effectuate substantial accomplishment of any one or more of."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the gentleman think that his amendment is germane?

Mr. JONES. I think so.

Mr. SNELL. If this is a continuation of the old law, what has been done under the old law?

Mr. JONES. I think I am correct in my information that they have used about three-quarters of that—a part of it on the cotton item and some for the purchase of butter, and a number of other different commodities in export and domestic consumption.

Mr. FIESINGER. Would it be possible to adopt the export debenture plan?

Mr. JONES. Partially, under section 12.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. Is it not a fact that the President asked for the repeal of this section in the A. A. A.?

Mr. JONES. I think he asked for that in the early days, before we lost the A. A. A.

Mr. TOBEY. The gentleman does not expect it to be repealed?

Mr. JONES. I hope not.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that out of the ninety-million-and-odd dollars that was available to the Secretary of Agriculture under this, upwards of \$50,000,000 was used in connection with the bonus payments to the cotton farmers?

Mr. JONES. About \$45,000,000.

Mr. TABER. And a considerable amount was used in furthering the export of peanuts.

Mr. JONES. A small amount on that.

Mr. TABER. Oh, a considerable amount.

Mr. JONES. That is true; but it helped us get out of a very difficult situation, and it will be used generally.

Mr. TABER. And the Comptroller General ruled that none of the funds might be expended for the purchase and distribution of agricultural commodities for relief.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TABER. So that none of that money has been used for any such thing as dairy products, or for wheat, or for corn, or anything of that kind. That is the situation.

Mr. JONES. This amendment would make it possible to use it in that way, and I am sure it will be used. In fact, I have a statement from the Secretary which I expect to read later on on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] a few questions. I have an amendment which I propose to offer on page 7, line 16, and I am wondering whether that amendment is inconsistent with the gentleman's amendment. I am in accord with the purpose of using 30 percent of the tariff receipts for the purchase plan which the gentleman has.

Mr. JONES. It accomplishes largely the purpose of the amendment which the gentleman shows me.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. And there will be nothing inconsistent with the gentleman's amendment, if my amendment is adopted?

Mr. JONES. The only trouble with the gentleman's amendment is that—

Mr. ZIONCHECK. It is definite and compulsory.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman does more than that. He compels them to determine just in what particular way it may be desirable to use the export feature. But he cannot use the export powers at all unless it is wholly impracticable to use any other. The provisions accomplish largely what the gentleman wants in permitting domestic diversion of surpluses.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. But there will be nothing inconsistent if my amendment is adopted. It would not be inconsistent with this.

Mr. JONES. Except that the gentleman's amendment would bind him down where he would not have a choice.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out section 2, page 8, and I do this for the purpose of again calling the attention of the chairman of the committee to the draftsmanship of this section. The bill reads:

SEC. 2. Section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, is amended by striking out that part of the last sentence thereof which precedes the second proviso and inserting in lieu thereof:

Mr. JONES. It is just part of one sentence.

Mr. MICHENER. Though I know it will do no good, I shall continue to object to this sort of thing.

Mr. JONES. I think the gentleman's criticism is probably correct. I regret the bill was not drafted in the way the gentleman has in mind; but in the report it is fully included.

Mr. MICHENER. I have made this criticism every time a bill has come to the floor in this way, and the gentleman from Texas, who admits it is wrong, still continues to bring in bills drafted in this way. I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that no judge could tell what the law was by reading this section, if enacted; that he would be obliged to take the original law, then his pencil, then this law, and then find the proper section and the proper paragraph and then strike out. A point that is very important is this: Eventually we will be compelled to first compile and then codify these laws, and it is going to be a very expensive proposition. You must first compile, and then you will have something which, when cited in court, will be only prima facie, and in the years to come you will have to codify, which will be more important. How easily this bill may be drafted correctly. Turn to page 10 of the committee report.

Mr. JONES. It is plain in the committee report.

Mr. MICHENER. You will find section 32 drafted there in the way in which it should be drafted, and all you need to do to correct this is to strike out the part of section 32, on page 10 of the committee report, which is in parentheses, and insert that which is in italics, and you will then have a properly drafted bill.

Mr. JONES. There was much more to the gentleman's argument before the Ramseyer rule was adopted. We have in the committee report a complete set-up of what the result would be.

Mr. MICHENER. That is just the difficulty about it. The Ramseyer rule attempts to bring to the House, and does bring to the House, the matter to which I am calling attention. In other words, you can read the report and know what the law is. The lawyer in the office, the judge on the bench, or the citizen who is supposed to obey the law does not have the report; he has only the law.

You cannot read the bill as presented and know what the law is. We had this very matter up before the Committee on the Judiciary this morning in considering the new register law. The reason this kind of legislation is reported in this form is so that you will not call the attention of the Members of the House to existing law as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state in answer that this committee is not the only one that sometimes engages in this practice. We are trying to make this bill short. The whole provision is set forth in the report, and if anybody is interested he can see what it is.

I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The pro-forma amendment was withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JONES: Page 9, add a new section, as follows: "SEC. 4. The sum of \$2,000,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation for relief purposes contained in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, approved April 8, 1935, is hereby made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for allocation in payment to the States in the southern great plains area or the farmers therein for wind-erosion control under plans to be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that was brought up yesterday and was withdrawn, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] wanted to go into it. I understand he has no objection to it. It is for immediate action to take care of that dust-storm area.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. I have one more amendment, Mr. Chairman. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 9, after line 9, insert the following:

"SEC. 5. Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after the words 'this title' wherever they appear the following: 'or the Soil Conservation Act, as amended'; and by striking out the words 'an adjustment' wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'any.'"

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this simply makes the import quota provision, which I think everyone is in favor of, available under this act as it was under the A. A. A. It is the same as the Senate bill.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### THE CONNECTICUT VALLEY TOBACCO FARMER

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, the bill before us today is important, not only to the agricultural sections of this country but equally so to the industrial sections. It has been proven time and time again that unless the farmer prospers the Nation will not prosper.

We have been through a period of depression, which had its sinister effects upon both agriculture and industry. We

have, aided by definite legislative efforts to remedy evils in our economic system, which not only contributed to the causes of the depression but aggravated its effects, emerged from that depression and have arrived at a certain degree of national economic recovery. The work of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration was important in the recovery which has come to the farmers of our land. I am going to vote for this measure before us, not only because I believe it will play an important factor in the continuance of national recovery, but more particularly, because of the benefits which stand to be gained by my own district, which is part of the Connecticut Valley, a section of the country prominent in agricultural activity and famous for its tobacco crop.

Whereas the emergency legislation enacted during the early years of this administration did much to set right our economic system and rescued it from the chaos into which it had been thrown, it is now important that we implement the gains we have made from the lessons during the years when we were attempting to set right our economic structure, and bearing in mind these lessons in the enactment of present and future legislation, write provisions which will make permanent the cure. At the same time we must be constantly on the alert to prevent the recurrence of old ills.

We have emerged from the depression. We are on the broad road to recovery. Every step of the way from now on we must make more firm the foundation of our recovery and strengthen the walls of its structure, so that it will be resistant, as far as possible, to future attack because of economic emergencies or disasters which no one can foresee.

I believe that as recovery continued for our agriculture, the more drastic regulations would have been discarded as farm income approached nearer to the levels of prosperity, and the supply of agricultural products became more nearly in line with consumer demand. But no opportunity was given for the further gradual amending of the A. A. A. regulations. The Supreme Court decision on January 6 made it imperative that the entire program be rewritten else all the gains of the last 3 years would have been lost. I say lost, because they had not become sufficiently firmly interwoven into the economic fabric of agriculture for us to have been able to drop the program entirely and assume that the policies would have continued by an involuntary impulse of all those engaged in the agricultural industry from the farmer down, without the regulation and supervision of law.

I look therefore upon this bill, which is before us as an important measure to implement the recovery which has come to our farmers and, of course, representing a part of the Connecticut Valley, I cannot help relating agriculture immediately to tobacco. The gains which have come to the tobacco industry in the Connecticut Valley I feel can be continued by the passage of this bill. Communications I have received from the tobacco farmers in the Connecticut Valley evidence their strong approval of the continuation of the program which is bringing them out of the red.

In the days when wigwags dotted the Connecticut Valley, when the Indian chiefs devoted their time to councils of war against neighboring tribes or to hunting and fishing, while their squaws did the manual labor, tobacco was grown by those Indians. The first white settlers soon learned to depend upon it as one of their chief sources of cash income.

The records of New England show that as early as 1640 a tobacco problem had to be solved by legislation, because on the statute books of that year there is an act restricting the importation of tobacco into the New England colony.

Down through the years the planting of tobacco increased and its importance to New England and particularly to the agriculture of the Connecticut Valley grew as cigars became popular. It did not take long for discriminate cigar smokers to discover that a cigar made of Connecticut Valley cigar leaf was a superior smoke. There was something about the soil of the Connecticut Valley which produced tobacco such as was highly pleasing to the gentlemen of taste, first in the Thirteen Colonies, and then in other States as they were added to the Union. Cigars became popular and Connecticut cigars were judged to be then, as now, among the world's finest smokes. The manufacture of cigars became a thriving

industry in the Connecticut Valley. At one time there were more than 20 cigar factories in the little rural town of Suffield, Conn.

The cigar industry continued to thrive and the Connecticut Valley cigar tobacco farmers prospered until shortly after the end of the World War. Then, the effect of a marked shift in smoking habits began to be felt. The production of cigars in the entire United States reached its peak in 1920 when more than 8,000,000,000 cigars were manufactured. More than 75 percent of them were made to retail at more than 5 cents each. Connecticut Valley tobacco furnished a large percentage of the binders and wrappers for these cigars.

Since 1920 there has been a continuous decline in the production of cigars in the United States. The 8,000,000,000 figure in 1920 dropped to 4,500,000,000 in 1933, a decline of about 44 percent. The 75 percent of them retailing at more than 5 cents each dropped to where today fewer than 15 percent of all cigars retail at more than 5 cents. There has been, however, a marked improvement in the situation since the inception of the A. A. A. in 1933. During the latter part of 1933, with the beginning of the return of prosperity and purchasing power, the production of cigars in the United States began to increase, and has gained consistently up to the present time.

But to get back to the cigar-leaf tobacco farmer in the Connecticut Valley. He began to face real trouble in 1921 when the price he received for his crop dropped to almost 50 percent. The total income from tobacco in the Connecticut Valley dropped from around \$25,000,000 to approximately \$12,000,000, a staggering drop, and, mind you, one which took place years before the big depression began in 1930.

Finance, industry, and commerce were pleading in 1933 for relief from their troubles, which they dated from approximately 1930. The cigar-leaf tobacco farmer in the Connecticut Valley had been having his troubles for 12 years. For 12 years he had been struggling along, producing more tobacco than was needed, in a desperate effort to maintain his farm income. Each year he sold his tobacco at little, if any, more than it cost him to grow it. And as a consequence his land, his buildings, his equipment, his standard of living declined almost continuously during this 12-year period.

The bottom was reached for the Connecticut Valley tobacco farmers in the winter of 1932-33. At that time they should normally have been marketing their 1932 crop but during the preceding years the consumption of cigars had drastically declined and the farmer had not curtailed his production to meet that decline. Instead, in his frantic effort to maintain a cash income with which to pay his taxes, interest, and most urgent cash expenditures, he had maintained the production of Connecticut Valley types of tobacco so far above consumptive levels, that surplus stocks of these types of tobacco had accumulated in the hands of manufacturers and dealers to the point where there was no market for them. Naturally when the manufacturer has more than adequate supplies in his own warehouses he isn't going to buy more from the farmer. It is far cheaper for him to allow the farmer to hold the tobacco on the farm at his own expense and risk, than for the manufacturer to buy and hold such tobacco.

The Connecticut Valley farmer therefore in the winter of 1932-33 found himself without a market for the products of his summer's labor. Taxes, mortgage interest, fertilizer, and farm supplies bills were unpaid. Telephones and electric lights were being cut off, and old worn-out automobiles were left in the garages unregistered. A valley that had prospered on its own initiative for 300 years was bankrupt.

The surplus supply of Connecticut Valley tobacco, including that held by farmers, was so high in the winter of 1932-33 that had there been no such tobacco grown for 2 years there would still have been no shortage. But how, in these modern times, were 3,000 farm families to just stop planting until that surplus was used up? They had to live. They needed cash to live and that cash could only be had by their labor on their farms—unless help from without was given them.

In the summer of 1933, acting under the newly inaugurated Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Secretary of Agriculture offered Connecticut Valley tobacco farmers contracts which provided for adjusting production to consumption in such a way that a normal relationship would exist at the end of a 3-year period. Benefit payments were offered to farmers who cooperated in this program which was devised to save them.

Under the 3-year operation of the adjustment program in the Connecticut Valley, the surplus stocks of tobacco, both in the hands of dealers and manufacturers and on the farms, have been greatly reduced and with the steady improvement in the cigar industry, production of tobacco in the Connecticut Valley can return to a level about equal to the 1929 level, and somewhat more than half the 1920 level.

The farm price per pound for Connecticut Valley tobacco had declined from around 40 cents per pound for the sun-grown types, and 65 cents per pound for the shade-grown type in 1919, to about 10 cents for sun-grown types and 59 cents for the shade-grown type in 1932. The shade-grown tobacco had not declined in price in proportion to the sun-grown tobacco because its production is controlled by a comparatively few people and production has usually been kept relatively close to consumption. Total gross income to the farmers for the sun-grown types of tobacco in the Connecticut Valley decreased from about \$20,000,000 in 1919 to \$2,750,000 in 1932, almost 86 percent. Through the Agricultural Adjustment program, the gross farm income for these types of tobacco increased to more than \$3,000,000 in 1933, and \$4,500,000 in 1934, and will be close to \$5,000,000 in 1935, an 80-percent gain from the 1932 income figures. Benefit payments comprise less than 10 percent of these figures. It is plainly seen, therefore, that the greater part of this recovery since 1932 is directly due to the cooperative effort of the farmers with the program devised for them by the Federal Government.

If the production of these types of tobacco does not exceed the quantity needed for consumption in 1936, and a price approaching a "fair exchange price" is received by the farmer, the total gross income to tobacco farmers in 1936 should be practically double that of 1935 because the farmers, in their effort to reduce the total supply to normal, have been producing only about one-half of the tobacco consumed during the past 3 years.

All along I have said that the fullest benefits of the program of the Roosevelt administration may not be felt for several years. The tobacco farmers of the Connecticut Valley will feel the benefits of the A. A. A. program more fully as time goes on.

While the very nature of the bill before us gives the farmer's position prime consideration, let us not forget for a moment the benefits which have accrued to business and industry because the farmer, during the past 3 years, has had more money to spend than he had in the previous several years. The merchants and mill owners and manufacturers of the Connecticut Valley can attribute directly to the farmer's increased income a good share of the profits which have given renewed life to their own affairs. I repeat what I said at the very beginning of this talk—so long as the farmer prospers the Nation will prosper.

The improvement gained in the Connecticut tobacco industry during the operation of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the protection of the farmers of the Connecticut Valley must continue. This bill before us seems to me the best that this Congress can give for the continued protection and improvement of the tobacco farmers, especially in view of the recent Supreme Court decision on the A. A. A. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CLAIBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I was brought up in the hard life of a farmer boy, and I know from grueling experi-

ence the trials and tribulations of those who toil on the farm, and I am willing to stumble along in this trial-and-error fashion to try to do my humble part to bring happiness to the millions of our rural homes, where there is always and everlastingly a minimum of comforts and a maximum of unrequited toil.

When I vote on this measure, the golden strands of memory lead me back to the old log-cabin home and to the little churchyard in Indiana where my beloved parents sleep. They were among the Hoosier pioneers who have been portrayed in poetry and song as "the salt of the earth." They were truly that. I can see my father, in hickory shirt and overalls, waging a man's fight against adversity, and I wish, as I have a thousand times, that I might always be inspired by his high ideals of honesty and of honor. I can see my mother, the personification of loving devotion, ministering to the needs of her large flock, trying to do many things at once and pausing now and then to kiss our tiny wounds to take away the hurt. I can see her in the silent vigils of the night as, by light of candle or oil wick burning low, she smooths a feverish brow with hand that always seems to soothe and heal. Once more, in my imagination, she tucks me in the trundle bed and sings her lullabies until the sandman closes my eyes in slumber.

O Mr. Chairman, if I were to offer my life, it would seem to me but a small recompense for the love of such worthy parents as God gave me; and if by any act of mine I can ameliorate the lot of our country people, among whom I was born when Indiana was yet a semiwilderness, and among whom I grew to manhood's estate, that act will be gladly, devotedly, and lovingly performed. It is in that spirit that I support this bill, having none too much confidence in it and yet hoping for the best.

In a long career as a newspaper correspondent that has brought me into contact with the world's brightest minds, I have known many persons, born to the purple, whom high station has not corrupted nor wealth despoiled, and whose hearts are ever warm and true; but I thank the Almighty that I was born a commoner, for it seems to me that virtue and the worth-while springs of thought and action are found more often in hovels than in palaces. When I was a boy, I learned that a hickory shirt or a calico dress may cover a heart as pure as gold. I hope that I may be permitted always to be near to the common people, to share their griefs and sorrows, even their distress and poverty, as well as the happiness that sometimes comes from hopes achieved, for by keeping the common touch I may have the inspiration to perform my full part in that fine and genuine type of humanitarian service where heart meets heart in sympathy and helpfulness.

All of my ancestors as far as I know clear back to Adam were farmers. The Indiana farm which supported my sisters, my brother, and myself when we were young is now ours by inheritance. One good turn deserves another, and in the gloomy period of agricultural depression during recent years it has been our duty to support it. Although I represent a city district in this great lawmaking body, I recognize that agriculture is the fundamental basis of all prosperity and that when the farmer becomes prosperous the city man is certain to share his prosperity through the market which develops when our farmers have purchasing power. This bill is a vast improvement over the Agricultural Adjustment Act, in that it levies no processing taxes and has no compulsory features that might tend to make the Secretary of Agriculture a major dictator. The adoption of the so-called McCormack consumers' amendment protects the interests of consumers.

The State of Indiana, of which I have the honor to be a Representative, is one of the best agricultural States in this matchless Union of States. It produces a great variety of crops, including a wonderful crop of poets. When you scratch an Indiana farmer under the skin, the chances are about 9 to 1 that you will find a poet. The other day one of our young Hoosier farmers, sitting on the edge of the horse trough and ruminating over the prospect, was temporarily overcome by the muse. This disciple of Agricola is a good deal of a philosopher, and he got to thinking. It

seemed to him there was something lacking in life. As he sat there on the horse trough he began to have his doubts as to whether he was having a good time. On long and mature reflection it seemed to him that he was not. Now, every Hoosier is innately endowed as one of two classes. He is either a natural-born politician or a natural-born poet. This young Hoosier farmer had never suspected that there was anything wrong with him until the muse began to work in much the same way that a spirit overcomes a medium. He rushed into the house, brushed the baby out of the way, grabbed a discarded paper sack and a lead pencil, and wrote on the sack the following descriptive poem, entitled "Down on the Farm", which I think is a suitable contribution to this discussion, because it is so true to life:

DOWN ON THE FARM

Down on the farm, 'bout half past 4,  
I slip on my pants and sneak out of the door;  
Out of the yard I run like the dickens  
To milk 10 cows and feed the chickens,  
Clean out the barn, curry Nancy and Jiggs,  
Separate the cream, and slop all the pigs,  
Work 2 hours, then eat like a Turk,  
And, by heck, I'm ready for a full day's work.

Then I grease the wagon and put on the rack,  
Throw a jug of water in an old grain sack,  
Hitch up the horses, hustle down the lane,  
Must get the hay in, for it looks like rain.  
Look over yonder! Sure as I'm born,  
Cattle on the rampage and cows in the corn!  
Start across the medder, run a mile or two,  
Heaving like I'm wind-broke, get wet clear through.  
Get back to the horses, then for recompense  
Nancy gets straddle the barbed-wire fence.  
Joints all a-aching and muscles in a jerk,  
I'm fit as a fiddle for a full day's work.

Work all summer till winter is nigh,  
Then figure up the books and heave a big sigh.  
Worked all year, didn't make a thing;  
Got less cash now than I had last spring.  
Now, some people tell us that there ain't no hell,  
But they never farmed, so they can't tell.  
When spring roll 'round I take another chance.  
While the fringe grows longer on my old gray pants.  
Give my s'penders a hitch, my belt another jerk,  
And, by heck, I'm ready for a full year's work.

[Applause.]

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, time under general debate was so limited on this bill that many Members had no opportunity to speak. For that reason I requested no time under general debate, but I am constrained, out of a sense of personal duty, to take advantage of this opportunity, if for only 5 minutes, to register my vigorous and unalterable opposition to this vicious legislation. I speak only for myself. Though I come from a great dairy and poultry-raising district, I believe, with all the conviction of my heart, that this legislation is fundamentally wrong and basically unsound.

This bill wears a false face. Rip the mask off it and look at it in its stark nakedness, and you will see it is the most perfect example of hypocrisy that has yet been presented to this body at this session. It is called "a soil-conservation act"; and yet every Member of this House must know, and anyone else who has read the bill must know, that it could more properly and accurately be called a "crop-control act." It is simply an attempt to circumvent the recent decision of the Supreme Court on the A. A. A. It is a stubborn refusal on the part of many Americans to admit the failures of that bureaucratic agency.

The first great New Deal experiment was the N. R. A., which attempted to regulate industry. God knows it was as "dead as a dodo" long before the Supreme Court rendered its decision. The cause for its failure was that an attempt to force the members of any single industry in a country so vast and diversified as the United States, where conditions and cost of living vary so greatly, to conform to a single universal standard, is sheer idiocy and impossible of accomplishment. What the N. R. A. attempted to do to industry the A. A. A. attempted to do to agriculture. This bill, Mr. Chairman, instead of aiding agriculture, is destined to destroy agriculture. Instead of liberating the American

farmer, it will enslave the American farmer. He will be forced indirectly, if not directly, to carry out the dictatorial mandates of an autocratic Secretary of Agriculture, who can withhold funds to the various States until they agree to comply with the regulations which he himself arbitrarily sets down. With the powers of a czar he can regiment the American farmers and, contrary to the laws of nature, attempt to force American agriculture into a strait jacket.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I am sorry I cannot in the brief time at my disposal.

In other words, orders will be taken from the already over-centralized Government in Washington. I want to remind my good friends—some Republicans who will support this bill as well as my good Democratic friends—that Thomas Jefferson once said "if we had to take the advice from Washington when to sow and when to reap, God knows the American people would go hungry."

This bill reminds me of a flirtation with the farmer or an attempt to entice or lure him down a path in order to get the collar on him. When I was a little boy I fed the chickens and "slopped" the hogs, too. I can remember taking corn and sprinkling it on the lawn, enticing the chickens into the pen only to wring their necks after I got them in. This bill is nothing more than an intention to continue the flow of checks to the poor farmer until after this coming election, posing as his friend, when in reality if the provisions of this measure are applied and carried out they will mean not only his economic serfdom but also the surrender of his own individual liberty. This is class and sectional legislation. It is attempted bribery of a large portion of our electorate, but my people will not be bought and sold as cattle and my farmers will not sell their souls for a mess of pottage. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. REILLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who knows the real facts is, indeed, an optimist if he believes this bill is going to solve the farmer's problem. I am a real farmer; I live on a farm and have for years. I know all about farmers' troubles, know all about their income; and I want to say in defense of this bill and of the acts of this administration that the only friend the farmer has ever had in the White House is there now. [Applause.] This is the fact, and the only Congresses that ever passed any legislation really helping the farmer were the Seventy-third and the Seventy-fourth. Other acts meant nothing to the farmer. That any colleague of ours coming from an agricultural district, as does the gentleman from Missouri, should make such broad, sweeping statements as he did I simply cannot understand.

I say this is not going to solve our problems. They are deeper than can be reached by legislation of this kind. First, there is taken a tremendous toll from everything the farmers produce from the time of production to the ultimate consumer.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have to move along in this House with legislation that will control the market. I believe the time to do that is here. So far as price fixing is concerned, it is not in the offing, but if we do not take action on fixing prices other men, who will take our places, will be forced to do so. It is already an accepted thing in many of the countries of the world. The price of wheat today is fixed in Argentina, Canada, France, and Germany. We fixed the price of wheat during the time of the war. If it can be done in time of war, why not in time of peace?

We also have to solve the problem of transportation.

We have not reached it at all. From my own farm, 300 miles from tidewater, it costs 15½ cents for the transportation of a bushel of wheat to tidewater. From just a few hundred miles beyond, in the State of Idaho, which contains thousands of acres of wheat, they paid more to take that wheat to tidewater than it was worth on the market when

this administration came into power in March 1933. Why? Because of the terrific overcapitalization of the transportation lines and the endeavor to earn dividends upon this overcapitalization. Of course, you may say that the railroads are in trouble. Of course, they are; but if they had taken the deflation in their capitalization that I have taken in connection with my farm, then they could pay dividends and expenses. The difficulty is they have been trying to earn dividends upon a terrific overcapitalization which they have carried right up to this time.

The A. A. A. was a real help to the producing country. There is no question about that. The money that came to us was like manna from Heaven, came from the entire people, and they quite generally profited because the farmer was more prosperous.

An English scholar, writing in the last Harper's on Progress and Catastrophe, surveys history for periods of progress and of retrogression. He suggests that the Roman world finally collapsed largely because of decay of agriculture and corruption of government. It is within our power to eliminate these factors which have already entered our civilization. Let us recognize them as symptoms of decay and deal with them effectively now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. TABER: I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this bill advocates for the next year or two the same doctrine of scarcity that has practically destroyed our export cotton market and which has resulted in the importation of upwards of 30,000,000 bushels of wheat, 40,000,000 bushels of corn, 200,000,000 pounds of butter, great quantities of beef and pork, as well as all sorts of agricultural and dairy products. This A. A. A. policy, along with the Reciprocal Tariff Act, has benefited the foreign farmer to the tune of \$150,000,000 to \$200,000,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, the bill proposes to continue this situation on a temporary basis for a year or two, and at the same time develop greater fertility of the soil and greater capacity to produce. So that if the doctrine of scarcity is correct, we are killing it off just as fast as we can. It is so ridiculous that on its face no one who is a friend of the farmer can vote for it. On top of that it very seriously discriminates against the dairy farmer. Frankly, there is not anything to this bill except an attempt to hand out money to the farmer in anticipation of election.

Mr. Chairman, in my territory, one of the best farm territories in the East, farm distress has never been so great as this year. With the operations that have been gone through by this administration, together with the breaking down of the tariff barriers and the letting in of foreign wheat and dairy products, pork, and all that sort of thing, we are in the worst situation we have ever been in. I hope that the Members of the House will use some sense and break away from the major policy of this administration of pulling both ends against the middle. That is all that is being done in this bill. It is bad all the way through, and we ought not to go on with these things.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I think the gentleman from New York has a duty to speak on this matter, and I want to remind him that although his State paid into the Federal Government last year \$672,000,000; his farmers received only about a half million dollars in benefits, while the farmers of Texas, for instance, received \$132,000,000 from this source alone. I think the Members who represent the States which pay this bill should not be criticized in their opposition, whether com-

ing from New England or other sections. With a tax bill coming in here within a few days, we have a reason for speaking on this matter, knowing where the money will have to come from to pay these benefits.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this bill is like the A. A. A. It is an attempt to enslave the farmer. It is like the N. R. A., which attempted to enslave the businessman. It is communistic. If we are going to retain the liberties of the American people, it is absolutely impossible to go on with this sort of thing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the philosophy of the gentleman and my philosophy are so far apart that it is hardly worth while to attempt an answer. If the gentleman will but examine the income of the farm population during the 4 years 1928 to 1932, when the philosophy of his party was in force, and look at the paralysis that enveloped the whole farm population, finally creeping up into the very heart of the Nation and destroying the commerce of the Nation, he would not make such an assertion as he made here just now in reference to this bill. [Applause.] If there ever has been a time on this earth since the foundation of the Republic when we got into a jam it was during those years, during which time we adopted policies that crowded the farmer down below a living level and destroyed the prosperity of the whole Nation. This does not advocate a doctrine of scarcity. Any man who has read the story of China and some of those old countries over there knows that if we are not going to have a land of poverty and a loss of character we must save and conserve the soil of this country. Read the history of the oldest country in the world that is in existence today and draw the parallel.

We do not advocate a doctrine of scarcity. In addition to soil erosion the next purpose is provision for maintenance of a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities, adequate to meet domestic and foreign consumer requirements, and at prices fair to both producers and consumers.

I have stated many times, and I stated in my speech on this bill, that I believed we ought to grow all the farm products that the market will absorb, both at home and abroad. To strike down this measure at this point would mean that you advocate this country sinking back to the despairing level it had reached in 1932. [Applause.]

I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to strike out the enacting clause.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is on the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: On page 5, line 22, after the word "producers", insert a comma and the following: "including tenants and croppers"; on page 6, line 8, after the word "made", insert a comma and the following: "and in determining the apportionment of any payment or grant with respect to any land, the Secretary shall take into consideration the contribution in services of tenants and croppers, and any loss of income sustained by tenants and croppers by reason of changes in the farming practices adopted during such years."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has just been read is a compromise. All important legislation is usually more or less a matter of compromise.

In my remarks in the House on Wednesday I called attention to what I believed was the failure of the pending bill to give adequate recognition to the rights of tenants and sharecroppers. The language of the amendment which has just been proposed is not the language which I would have suggested to correct this manifest inequality. It is, however, language which, I understand, is satisfactory to the Committee on Agriculture, as I have been informed by its chairman; and language which will, in my judgment, demonstrate clearly to the Secretary of Agriculture the purpose and intent of Congress that in carrying out the provisions of this legislation the tenant and the sharecropper shall receive a fair share of the benefits that are to be paid thereunder, and for

this reason and because it is not possible to secure an amendment of the character and strength that I would desire, I hope those who entertain the same views I do with regard to this subject matter may agree to the amendment.

The criticisms I expressed on Wednesday concerning this bill were, in my judgment, well-founded. I am glad that the validity of part of them has been recognized and some manifest defects in the bill have been corrected, and it is promised that others will be. Section 11, vesting absolute power in the Secretary of Agriculture to make any rules and regulations having the effect of law he may see fit, has been stricken. The tenants and sharecroppers must receive a fair share of benefits under the pending amendment, if adopted, unless the Secretary disregards the express mandate of Congress, and he surely will not do that.

I still do not like the bringing in of this bill before the tax bill to get the money to pay these benefits is brought in. I am sorry we have to rely upon the working out in conference of proper restrictions upon the power of the Secretary to allocate funds as between States; but, as I stated on Wednesday, it is my purpose to support every sincere effort to help the farmer, and I now intend upon the faith of an understanding with the chairman of the committee to support the bill.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, I am correct in stating that the amendment meets with the approval of the committee.

Mr. JONES. I should like to state, if I may, in this connection, that a similar amendment has been prepared by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK], and I have talked it over with both of the gentlemen, and the amendment is satisfactory to me and to those with whom I have conferred. It seeks to protect, and we all want to protect, the tenants and sharecroppers in the administration of the act.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELCHER] has a similar amendment and has rendered efficient aid in bringing about an agreement with the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an amendment which I had intended to offer in clear and more definite language, and I wish to further continue for a moment in order to ask the chairman of the committee about another section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The amendment referred to is as follows:

Amend by striking the period and inserting a comma at the end of line 20, on page 6, and adding the following language: "and shall not be made if the result of such utilization has been to reduce tenant population on such lands below an average of such population, counting only heads of families, for a representative period, nor if the landowner excludes his tenants from a fair share of such benefits. The determination of what would be such fair division of benefits between landlord and tenants shall be based upon the proportion of such lands upon which benefits are paid which under normal farm practices on such lands as shown by such practices during a representative period would have been available for cultivation by such tenants had such utilization on account of which benefits are paid not occurred."

Mr. TARVER. May I direct the attention of the chairman of the committee to section 7 (g), which relates to the limitations placed upon the Secretary of Agriculture in the making of apportionments between States.

On Wednesday I offered what I thought were justified criticisms concerning the unlimited nature of this power and the lack of adequate restriction. The Senate bill contains a very much more restricted provision, and I have been assured by the chairman that it is his purpose, as chairman of the House conferees, in the event the bill goes to conference to obtain a provision as strictly defining and limiting the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture in making these apportionments between the States as can possibly be obtained. Am I correct in this understanding?

Mr. JONES. We will do the very best we can.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Tarver amendment may be again read.

The Clerk read the Tarver amendment.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and withdraw my own amendment, which I put in the RECORD yesterday. The amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] apparently covers the situation.

Charges have been made all over this country, time after time, about conditions existing of sharecroppers, tenants, and agricultural workers all over the South and in many other parts of the Nation. Some well-informed people claim that the A. A. A. program was a detriment to two-thirds of the people of the South. I do not say it was. I was for the A. A. A. program and stayed with it, but the proposition is that the sharecroppers, the workers, and the tenants were not adequately protected, and I believe we should do something to protect them. The condition of these classes of people is of the very lowest living standard, and we should do something to correct it. The least we should do in this bill is to recognize such classes as existing like other human beings.

There is also another intelligent reason involved. We should protect the purchasing power of all the agricultural classes, and so I hope this amendment will carry.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield to my friend and colleague from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to my friend from Texas that in going over the district which I represent I heard a great many complaints from the farmers on smaller tracts, cultivating the 20 or 30 acres of cotton that had been allotted them, to the effect that they could not sell tax free the cotton that had been grown upon the allotted acreage, and in view of the fact that no man can tell when he plants the 20 or 30 acres what the yield will be, they thought it was an injustice to be taxed on the yield from the allotted acreage. In what way, under this measure, may we be assured that these farmers of small tracts of land will be protected?—because it seems to me the chief objection to the operation, for instance, of the Bankhead law came from the operators of small farms.

Mr. MAVERICK. Let my other colleague from Texas [Mr. JONES], chairman of the Agriculture Committee, answer that. I think I can answer "yes", but Mr. JONES is better qualified to answer.

Mr. JONES. I may suggest that practically all of that criticism was to the operations of the Bankhead Act, which as the gentleman knows, has been repealed. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has another amendment with respect to the small producers which I think will be agreed to.

Mr. LANHAM. I called attention to the fact that the condition I referred to was under the Bankhead Act.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, it is more difficult to get a chance to speak here than it is to prove a homestead in my country. [Laughter.] I come from a State where we have no other industry except farming.

Mr. BIERMANN. It is worth more to speak here than it is to prove a homestead in North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. What I as a Member of Congress and the gentleman from Iowa have been able to accomplish—I think I would not trade my homestead for what we have done. There is no argument on the question—we should do something for the farmers of the country. That is admitted; but in my opinion we have not the right as we are trying to do it in this bill.

I have voted with the majority of this House on everything that you have done here, but I would not be true to my convictions and independence if I sat here and voted for everything without some protest.

You are surrendering the power over the entire farming population to the Secretary of Agriculture. He will determine whether North Dakota goes into this plan or not—not only with making the rules and regulations, for we must take the rules and regulations made by the Secretary of Agriculture—but he will hand out the money.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. If it does not come out of my time.

Mr. PIERCE. Is there any other way that it can be done?

Mr. BURDICK. Oh, I have heard that argument time after time. They say you will have to vote for this bill because it is the only bill before Congress that will do something for the farmer.

That is not true, and those who make this statement know it is untrue. There are bills before the Congress that will prevent 2,000,000 farms from going to foreclosure, but you will not consider them. You want to conserve the soil. What I want to do is to prevent the sheriff from selling the farms and putting the farmers and their families out.

There is the Massingale bill, the Eicher bill, and the Frazier-Lemke bill.

You have time enough to debate those bills. Why not bring those bills up and let us vote on them? Suppose the farmers do not like what is in this bill? What can they do? You have taken away the right of appeal. The only thing you can do is to go to the Secretary of Agriculture. There is no appeal to any court. Is that what Congress wants to do? The Secretary of Agriculture is to make the rules and regulations.

Let me refer to the exact language—I want to read it to you:

No such plan shall be approved by its terms unless it provides that the agency to administer the plan shall be the land-grant college or colleges in the State or such other State agency as may be approved by the Secretary.

Who is going to plan out the business? It will be done from Washington, and I say to you that that is wrong.

For God's sake, where are the ideals and standards the South used to possess? There was a time when the South believed in slavery, but we did not; now everybody believes in slavery, and you are trying to make slaves of the farmers in the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to this committee control of Congress. No element of our national make-up is so dangerous to the liberties of the American people. Day before yesterday you witnessed the unusual action of the Rules Committee enacted here on this floor. You saw the chairman of the Rules Committee and the ranking Republican member, under the guise of adopting a resolution for an investigation into the financial support given the Townsend movement, launch a combined attack against the plan itself. When time was yielded to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] to lambast the plan and put Dr. Townsend in a class with criminals, before the investigation begins, the genial and affable Republican from Pennsylvania was very happy to yield an additional 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri so he could complete the execution of this committee plan. Of the full hour's debate on the resolution, only 9 minutes of that time was granted to the Townsend supporters.

Here, on this bill, committee members have the preference in time and no one else need apply. A Member may be the best-informed man in this House on a particular subject, yet, under these intrenched rules, he is out. There is only one chance to get in and that is to maneuver your way in for a few brief minutes by either moving to strike out a word, offering an amendment, moving that the committee do rise, or some other sleight-of-hand performance that the Member does not mean, and which the House would not believe if he did mean it.

I am now taking advantage of this sleight-of-hand performance and will get 3 minutes more to debate the farm bill, in addition to what I have thus far been compelled to say. On every section read, however, I will try to strike out the last word, or any number of words, until I can deliberately filch time enough to express my disapproval of this bill. If this committee will not yield me the time by unanimous consent, I will consume twice that time in sparring for an opening. I advise this committee now that from this moment on I will exercise all of the freedom there remains under this system of rules.

This bill provides for the most despotic and bureaucratic control of millions of people by one man ever brought on the floor of Congress in our entire history. Every paragraph

is reeking with concentrated power in the hands of one man. State lines and States' rights are trampled under foot. Where is there any independence left in this country? Where are those staunch advocates of the rights of States? Where has gone the independence of Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson, of Virginia; where is the independence exhibited by Old Hickory, by Calhoun, and the great statesmen of the South? Has that spirit died? Has it been crushed to the earth, never to rise again?

Read the bill, Members of this House, read it.

What does it propose to do?

There are five purposes mentioned, but the one and only purpose intended is to get around the decision of the Supreme Court and leave the control of the very lives of the tillers of the soil in the hands of Secretary Wallace.

What is the proof? Line 13, page 2, provides as follows:

Any State which submits to the Secretary, prior to such time and in such manner and form as the Secretary prescribes, a State plan—

And so forth.

Could it ever be a State plan? No; for it must finally be in form as the Secretary prescribes it—it must be approved by him. How can he enforce this right? He can do it by the use of money at a time when people are hungry and are losing their all. Unless the States meekly comply with the Secretary's orders, no money will be paid them. Duress appears in every line of this bill. All are slaves except the Secretary of Agriculture.

Can the Secretary tell the States who can administer the act? Yes. Is this right denied the States? Yes. Here is the language of the bill:

No plan will be approved unless by its terms:

It provides that the agency to administer the plan shall be a land-grant college or colleges in the State or such other State agency as may be approved by the Secretary.

Even the methods of the operation and the plan and the details will be such as the Secretary finds necessary for the effective administration of the plan.

Under the bill the Secretary is authorized to fill our State with carpetbaggers, to see that the plan is being carried out as he thinks it should.

Whenever the Secretary's plan, whenever the details of management used is the Secretary's plan and detailed arrangement, whenever the people of a State will purringly submit to his will, then, in that event, they may expect payments to be made to them by the Secretary. The Secretary becomes a financial monarch and the farmers his powerless vassals; and the States that permit it must suffer their independence and their State rights to be swept aside under the guise of the protection of the soil.

Is this Congress incapable of providing proper methods of soil protection without creating an autocratic power to replace the power of Congress?

How is this money to be distributed among the farmers of the different States? Here is what the bill says:

On or before November 1 of each year the Secretary shall apportion among the several States the funds which will be available; and, in determining the amount of the apportionment, the Secretary shall, among other things, take into consideration the acreage and productivity of land devoted to agricultural purposes.

Has ever any such power been granted to anyone anywhere?

The Secretary is clothed with power also to limit production. The bill reads:

The Secretary shall have power to carry out the provisions of the bill by making payments or grants or other aid to agricultural producers based upon (3) a percentage of their normal production of any one or more agricultural commodities—

And so forth.

Any payment or grant of aid made under subsection 4 shall be conditioned upon such utilization by the producer of his land, or part thereof, as the Secretary finds has tended to further the purposes specified—

And so forth.

The Secretary shall prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out this act.

Page 7, lines 6 and 7.

Section 14 suspends all law and bars a farmer from taking any appeal in any matter of production and payments, for the bill says, "shall not be subject to review except by the Secretary of Agriculture." Can it be that this Congress is willing to submerge our independence and strangle a citizen's right of appeal, by making any one man the court of last resort in this great Republic? We are already complaining because nine men have such power.

Finally, this bill allows the Secretary of Agriculture to keep the A. A. A. going so far as the horde of employees are concerned and so far as the autocratic powers conferred upon the Secretary are concerned. The A. A. A. is not stopped except as to the contract made with the farmer.

The plea is heard around the Chamber that this is not a good bill but the best that can be obtained, and, therefore, the friends of the farmers must vote for it.

The argument has already been advanced in this debate that no one offered a better plan. Both statements are false and known to be false by those making them.

We do not have to vote for this bill—we can defeat it and consider another bill. We can consider a real bill—any bill if the administration will permit it. The charge is also false that no one has brought forward a better bill. There are two bills pending now—one the Massingale bill, the other the Eicher bill—providing a plan that will bring actual relief to the farmers in an orderly way. Where are the bills? Lodged in the committees of Congress upon administration orders, and they will never see the light of day. Is there any bill before Congress which will save 2,000,000 farm homes? Yes. It is the Frazier-Lemke bill. But where is it? It is locked up safely in the Rules Committee, and the same administration supporting this bill will not permit Congress to save these homes.

As long as Congressmen can be bamboozled, no other bill can be brought before the Congress, and they think their only chance to show their support of the farmer is to vote for a makeshift bill, the longer real legislation for the farmers will be delayed. Many Members of Congress do not dare vote against a makeshift bill, for they feel that at home they will be charged with voting against the only measure which can be passed. When the A. A. A. Act was passed the plea was universally made in Congress that it was an emergency measure, but in the operation of the act the attempt was made to make it permanent. The provisions of the bill are designed to make it a permanent program for agriculture and with the admission on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture that the A. A. A. was not intended to bring back parity prices to the farmers, I am at a loss to understand why Secretary of Agriculture Wallace insists on pursuing a program which has no hopes of ever establishing parity of prices for the American farmers.

In 1 year in North Dakota something like \$12,000,000 was doled out in benefit payments, while, if during that same period the cost-of-production program had been in operation, these same farmers would have received \$58,000,000.

The Secretary admits that the A. A. A. did not intend a parity price for farmers—he does not claim this bill will bring parity price.

The A. A. A. was intended as a dole; this bill provides for a dole. If the farmers of my State are to be slowly starved to death, we might as well make quick work of it and refuse your dole payments altogether. What this bill prohibits for one class of farmers it guarantees to another class, under different conditions, in the matter of production, and in the end the sum total loss to agriculture will be what it would be without the act.

If we had no gag rule in this House, the farmers would soon show the Secretary of Agriculture a farm bill that would save farm homes, restore purchasing power, revive business, provide jobs for the unemployed, and furnish food for the hungry. But no; that cannot be permitted. We must be compelled to vote for a bill that will positively injure our farmers instead of helping them, and will prostitute the State rights of every last State in the Union.

What moral right have we to compel farmers of the United States to destroy and reduce agricultural products,

and at the same time open up our markets to foreign agricultural products?

While Wallace has been messing around killing pigs, and taking agricultural fields out of production, the following tables tell the story of imported agricultural products:

Imports (in pounds)		
	1934	1935
Beef and veal.....	136,972	7,115,925
Hams, bacon, etc.....	547,223	2,395,608
Canned meats.....	26,215,757	49,770,402
Lard, etc.....	296,185	10,758,779
Butter.....	436,695	21,825,263

Department of Commerce figures above for the first 8 months of the last 2 years tell their own story—the story of eating our neighbor's beef.

The figures on grain are equally important. Corn came in from the Argentine. Wheat came in from across the border from Canada while thousands of acres of rich land lay idle. The importation of Polish rye from a country wise enough to pay cost of production to its farmers came into this country in such volume as to destroy domestic prices right at a time when that was our best crop in America.

How long will the farmers of America submit to the treatment Congress has and still is forcing them to endure?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. I have prepared a similar amendment, as follows:

On page 5, line 22, immediately following "producers", add a comma and insert the following: "including tenants and croppers", and add another comma.

On page 6 of said bill, line 8, following the word "made", insert a comma and the following: "and in determining apportionment, or amount, of any payment or grant, with respect to any land, the Secretary shall take into consideration the contribution in services of tenants and croppers, and any loss of income sustained by tenants and croppers by reason of changes in the farming practices adopted during such years."

Mr. Chairman, I have offered an amendment to this bill, it being H. R. 10835, having for its purpose to promote the conservation and profitable use of agricultural land resources by temporary Federal aid to farmers and by providing for a permanent policy of Federal aid to States for such purposes.

My amendment seeks to modify this bill only on page 5, line 22, immediately following "producers" add a comma and insert the following: "including tenants and croppers", and add another comma. The other portion of the amendment is on page 6 of said bill, line 8, following the word "made", insert a comma and the following:

And in determining apportionment or amount of any payment or grant with respect to any land, the Secretary shall take into consideration the contribution in services of tenants and croppers, and any loss of income sustained by tenants and croppers by reason of changes in the farming practices adopted during such years.

It is obvious from this amendment that I am offering, proposing several changes, that I am attempting to make some provision for the small farmers of America. It is not my purpose to criticize any measure that tends to help agriculture, but I want to say to you that under the present rules and regulations, giving to the Secretary the right to use his discretion as to how this distribution of \$500,000,000 should be handled, that no provision is made for anyone except the landowners. I appreciate the fact that it is primarily for the purpose of conserving the soil, but literally it is intended to help the farmers.

The talk that the small farmers, or the tenant farmers, are not being helped, and have not been helped, but instead have suffered, ceases to be a passing conversation, and is in reality a grim fact. In my district I know it to be a certainty, and I have seen it with my own eyes, that many croppers and tenants have suffered from the requirements of the previous cotton program. When a man is not permitted to raise but a few pounds of cotton under this ruling, or any ruling, it is not sufficient to maintain his family, and

I have seen actual hunger and untold suffering in this sort of families, because in most instances they have numbers of children, and my amendment should be adopted adding a directory clause to the Secretary to help this class of farmers, because it is known, and none of us can deny, when a man's family suffers for the actual necessities of life he not only becomes a citizen who does not believe in his Government but you can see the blood in his eyes. In so doing we make, I fear, a situation that will be hard to control in future years.

I am pleading with this Congress to make provisions for the croppers and tenants to where they will be, in a measure at least, cared for, and I repeat to you that it has been a matter of great grief to me, the hardship that has been brought about on the croppers and tenants in my district, and it can be termed in no other manner than unfortunate.

Making myself clear, I hope this amendment will be adopted. I will support any legislation that has for its purpose to aid agriculture, but I do not think it is fair to prefer one class over the other; and in conclusion, I want to say to this body that when you return to your respective district you will be confronted with the situation as I bring it to you, and it will be vividly brought home to you, and in your failure to help adopt some measure that would relieve this situation will, in my opinion, be a source of regret to you later.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, after the period in line 15, insert "in carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary shall, in every practical manner, protect the interest of small producers."

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, the purpose of this amendment is to protect the interest of the little farmers and tenants. While I voted for the Bankhead Act, the original A. A. A., and the amendment, and, in fact, every farm measure that has been before us, I have never felt that this program has been administered in the interest of the little farmers and the tenants. When the Bankhead bill was first put into operation there were thousands of little farmers who had never produced more than three or four bales of cotton but who were given allotments of only a few hundred pounds. I denounced this program in telegrams to and conversations with A. A. A. officials. Before the farmers voted on the Bankhead bill the President assured them that there would be a minimum exemption of two bales. There was some improvement in the manner in which the allotments were made, but at no time were the interests of the little farmers and tenants safeguarded in the proper way.

#### LITTLE FARMERS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR OVERPRODUCTION

It must be borne in mind, Mr. Chairman, that the little farmers were not responsible for so-called overproduction. When I say "overproduction" I do not mean it in the way that it is commonly understood. Strictly speaking, there is no such thing as overproduction. If the consumers could satisfy their needs there would not be enough wheat, corn, hogs, or cotton. We really have underconsumption. What I mean by overproduction is the inability of the people to purchase what they need, which creates a surplus on the markets. As I said, the little farmers were not responsible for this condition. It was the cotton hogs who planted vast acres in cotton that should have been devoted to some other crop or left for grazing purposes that were responsible for this surplus. It was the great plantation and corporation farms, with tractors and modern machinery and with cheap pauper labor, that did more to bring about the surplus on the market than any other factor. Many of them went across the Rio Grande and imported Mexican labor, which enabled them to cultivate thousands of acres in cotton. These producers should be penalized under any farm program. As a matter of fact, some of them made thousands of dollars out of the A. A. A. and the Bankhead Act, while the little farmers,

who were blameless, were given a mere pittance. The unfortunate result was that the little farmer paid more of the processing taxes than the big one. In other words, the small farmers wear cotton goods while the big farmers were able to buy more expensive material. The processing tax for cotton was passed on to the consumers of cotton goods. The result was that the small farmers paid to a large extent the processing taxes, and many of them received only a small part back in rentals and benefit payments.

It is therefore necessary that we take every measure possible to protect the little farmers. Of course, I realize that regardless of what Congress writes into the law everything depends upon the proper administration of it. We can declare it our will that the small farmers be protected, but if the Secretary and his agents do not see fit our declaration will be of no value. However, I believe that an express statement in the bill that it is the will of Congress that the small farmers be protected will go a long way to see that this is done. At any rate, we can do no more under the circumstances, since the Secretary must be permitted flexibility in the administration of this program. We must also protect the interest of the tenants. In many sections some landowners have been unfair to the tenants. Thousands of them have been forced on relief.

In protecting the interest of the little producers we do much to solve the problem of unemployment. A huge farm cultivated on mass-production basis with modern machinery and cheap labor does not put many people to work. In addition to the creation of surplus on the market such farmers bring about unequal distribution of farm wealth. The owners derive a larger share of the farm income than the smaller farmers. In protecting the interest of the little farmer we increase employment. Let us say that 100 individual farmers cultivated 2,000 acres. This means employment for 100 heads of families. But if the same 2,000 acres are operated by one landlord with tractors and cheap labor, only a few men are given employment. No program will survive unless its purpose is to put as many people to work as possible with some assurance of fair return upon their labor and investment.

This bill does not represent everything I want. If I had my way I would write a farm program that would protect more completely the interest of the small producers, and that would spread and increase employment. I would make a much smaller benefit payment or rental to the big farmer who is responsible for overproduction than to the small farmer. This would be the surest way to discourage so-called overproduction and to find work for our thousands of idle people. I would go further and enable the many tenants to purchase small farms of their own. But I realize that I cannot have my way in the farm program. There are 434 other Members besides myself. In addition to this, we all know that no bill can become a law without the approval of the administration, and the bill before us is the only one that the administration has approved. I am therefore proceeding on the principle that if I cannot get a whole hog I will take half of one. It is certain that our farmers cannot produce and sell on an open and unprotected market and buy on a protected market. But I believe that the time will come when Congress and the administration will realize the necessity of a farm program that will more fully protect the millions of small producers and tenants who, after all, form the backbone of our agriculture.

#### CAUSES OF THE FARMERS' FLIGHT

While I have many times on the floor of this House and elsewhere discussed the causes of the farmers' condition, I want to repeat some of my former statements. There are two causes of the farmers' condition in America. In the first place, he is compelled to produce and sell on a competitive market and to buy on a protected or noncompetitive market. The result is that the ratio of exchange between what he produces and sells and what he buys is, and has been for many years, unequal and unfair. The same labor and investment that will bring 50-percent return in protected industries and fields of activities will not give the farmer more than 2 percent, and in many instances he operates at a loss. We must, therefore, either put all busi-

ness and all industries upon a strictly competitive basis, or failing in this we must put the farmer on the same protected plane as other industries. In other words, we must elevate agriculture to the same plane as that occupied by the protected industries. Our experience in the past has demonstrated that it is almost politically impossible to do away with the protection, tariff, and otherwise which industry enjoys in America. Therefore, the only other recourse is to give the farmer in the form of benefit payments, rentals, or whatever you may call it, a compensating tariff. In other words, if the monetary value of protection to all industries in America is a billion dollars per year, then the farmers must be given an equal amount to put them on the same plane of equality; otherwise the farmer is impoverished at the expense of the protected classes in our economic structure. This is fundamental, and no fair-minded person can take issue with it.

The next great cause of the farmers' plight is money. By money I include credit, which is the medium of exchange which performs to some extent the functions of hard money. This administration has perhaps done more to reform our monetary system than any previous administration. The passage of the gold revaluation bill and the Dies silver bill have done much, and will continue to do, more to establish an honest dollar. A fluctuating and changeable dollar, such as we have seen in the past, will impoverish the farming classes. From 1921 to 1929 the farmer borrowed a dollar, which represented to him and which was the equivalent of about 4 pounds of cotton. From 1929 to 1934 he was asked to pay back a dollar which represented about 11 pounds of cotton. So that the farmer was required to pay back four times as much in cotton, wheat, corn, or whatever he produced, as he actually got in value when he borrowed the money. This resulted in universal bankruptcies. When the farmers' purchasing power was destroyed, he was unable to buy the products of industry, and so in the end industry suffered as much as agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the Secretary of Agriculture will realize the plight of the little farmers and tenants and will administer this law in their interest, as my amendment requires. If he does not, the farm problem will be no nearer solution next year, or the year after, than it is today.

What we need is a simple plan that will not require an army of paid officials and a lot of red tape. Such a plan would be to give every little farmer a four- or five-bale allotment, and upon this allotment pay him in cash enough money to compensate him for the burdens of tariff and protection that are weighing heavy upon his shoulders. This would insure a decent income to the little producer and would put more people to work than any other measure that could be devised. In addition to this, make it possible for the tenant to own his own little farm.

I realize that this plan is too simple to appeal to the imagination of theoretical farmers. But some day we are going to come to such a plan of necessity. With this amendment that I am now proposing in the farm bill, the Secretary can accomplish the same results if he will administer the law in accordance with our wishes. If he does not do this, we will be back here in January to find out why he has not done it, and to take further steps to see that he does do it.

We have succeeded in writing into this bill the principle of the domestic allotment plan which I have been advocating for several years. In fact, the bill I introduced some time ago is based upon soil conservation and the domestic allotment plan with protection for the little farmers. I hope this bill will pass. [Applause.]

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. A few days ago I spoke on this floor on death and burial. I am now going to speak on resurrection, and the resurrection of the A. A. A. Resurrection is certainly the most important of the trinity. I deny that the A. A. A. has been a failure. I claim that the A. A. A. was a splendid movement to help the farmers, and that it did help the farmers, and no matter if this is an evasion of the A. A. A., it is in the right direction, and in my judgment

will help the farmers of this Nation, who know what they want. The farmers of this country know what they want; what they need. They are not fools. They do not have to be switched off from farming into the tariff question, as we have heard today. They know that this administration has tried to help them and has helped them.

I was pleased to hear the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture refer to the record. How was it in 1932 and the 4 years before 1932? Compare that with now. I am speaking in general on this bill, which I believe in, in the main, but I am speaking particularly on the Boileau amendment, which in my judgment will help the farmers of my particular section, the western part of Maine, and throughout New England. You folks from the South and from the Golden West voted for the Tobacco Act and we voted for the Cotton Act and you also voted for the Potato Act. I am asking you folks, you good Democrats and good Republicans—and, of course, there is a difference in Republicans—to stand for the Boileau amendment and for this whole bill.

The Boileau amendment prohibits this land of soil erosion and of soil conservation to be used for the raising of grass, alfalfa, or any crops the proceeds of which might be sold or used in rearing livestock or in feeding cattle, which would lend itself to aid in the crops which might bring about competition in the dairy business of New England and the northern United States and all of the dairy States of America, which for a long time have been hanging on by the skin of their teeth. I ask you men of the southern lands, where the cotton whitens under the stars and the wheat locks the sunshine in its bearded sheaf, and you of the West, where the wind ripples over the billowy seas of wheat and where there are oceans of corn, to give to us, the dairy farmers of the North, this Boileau amendment—a chance to live.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOILEAU: Page 6, after the period in line 15, insert "In carrying out the provisions of this section the Secretary shall, as far as practicable, assist voluntary growing of soil-improving or erosion-preventing crops for the purposes of soil rebuilding, but not for commercial use."

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state to the members of the committee that this is not the amendment that I had incorporated in the RECORD on yesterday. It is not the identical amendment that I have been advocating during the debate on this particular bill. However, it is a modified form of that amendment, and it is intended to be directed at the same evil that I conceive to exist in the bill in its present form. The amendment that I had incorporated in the RECORD and that I had intended to offer at this time provided that the Secretary shall not make any payment or grant of other aid to any producer, based upon the taking of land out of one use and putting it into another unless no crops were harvested from such lands for sale, and further, unless no livestock intended for sale or the products of which were intended for sale, were pastured or grazed on such lands. This amendment does not go as far as my original amendment did. Many Members on the floor of the House and others who are interested in this bill have stated that the original amendment raised a constitutional question, and for that reason expressed their intention to vote against the amendment. The amendment I now offer certainly is not unconstitutional. I regret to state to the membership of the House that it has not as many teeth in it as my original amendment, although I am convinced that a fair administration of this amendment will accomplish the same results intended under the original amendment.

This amendment provides that in the carrying out of the provisions of this section the Secretary shall, as far as practical, assist the voluntary growing of soil-improving or erosion-preventing crops for the purposes of soil rebuilding, but not for commercial use.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield in that connection?

Mr. BOILEAU. In just a minute I will yield.

I submit if the amendment is written into the law, if the Secretary of Agriculture gives to this provision a fair interpretation, he will exert all of the powers, all of the practical powers that will be given to him under this bill, to prevent such lands from being used for pasturing livestock or for growing crops for feed for livestock, and in other respects he will do all he possibly can and use all the powers given to him under the bill to prevent commercial competition on the part of those who are being paid benefits for taking these lands out of production of soil-depleting crops.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This is a very important proposition. Of course, the general principles announced in the first part of the gentleman's amendment are amply covered by the general principles of the bill. The gentleman will admit that?

Mr. BOILEAU. I think that is true.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What a great many of us want to know specifically is the gentleman's interpretation of the last language of his amendment, that it shall not be used for commercial use.

Mr. BOILEAU. My interpretation of that language is simply this. That the Secretary shall use all the powers he has, as far as practical, to prevent those farmers who get benefits for taking lands out of production of a certain commodity, from using those lands to produce crops for sale, or to feed livestock intended for sale, or the products of which are intended for sale.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In order to clarify this situation, I would like to ask the gentleman one further question. I do not know whether I can agree with this amendment or not, personally. Suppose a farmer in Kansas, for instance, takes 50 acres off of his farm for soil conservation under the purposes of this bill, and he plants it into legumes or other soil-building or erosion-prevention crops: What limitation under this amendment would be placed upon the production from that land?

Mr. BOILEAU. I want to make this statement: During the last 50 years the Department of Agriculture has been attempting to educate the farmers of this country that the best way to conserve the soil would be to plant grass and plow it under. If it is practical to plow under such grasses—which I believe it is, and which I believe is in absolute conformity with the teachings of the Department of Agriculture over a period of years—if the Secretary of Agriculture finds that is a practical way in which to conserve the soil and rebuild the soil, then he must do all he possibly can, go as far as he can, to assist the voluntary growing of such soil-improving and erosion-prevention crops for the purpose of rebuilding the soil and not for commercial use. In other words, he shall do all he possibly can to require them to plow under that crop or use other accepted methods in order to conserve the soil and take it out of commercial production. It seems clear to me.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In other words, under the gentleman's construction he could not sell any possible crop that he might raise on any of the land taken out of production?

Mr. BOILEAU. If the Secretary of Agriculture should conclude that it is practical to plow under that ground, which I believe it is practical to do and the advisable thing to do, then he would require that it be plowed under or laid fallow, rested, or in some other way taken out of production. In other words, he should not permit that land to be used for

growing crops for sale or for feeding livestock if it is practical to prevent it. I believe it is practical to prevent it.

Mr. JONES. That is not my interpretation.

Mr. BOILEAU. I am accepting this interpretation of the language. I am accepting this language, and I may say to the Members of the House that the chairman and myself agreed upon the language but did not discuss the interpretation to be placed upon it. I collaborated with many of my colleagues on this proposition who are interested in dairying. We have agreed to accept this modified form of amendment. I understood the chairman of the committee agreed to accept it. I placed this interpretation upon it. I am not, of course, bound by the gentleman's interpretation, nor is he bound by my interpretation. It seems to me the language is very clear.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree at all with the gentleman's interpretation of the amendment, and I would like to state my own interpretation of it.

Mr. BOILEAU. I would be very glad to have the gentleman do so that we may understand the situation exactly.

Mr. JONES. I could not agree to the gentleman's interpretation at all, and I would like to get time to state my interpretation, to see if we cannot agree on something.

Mr. BOILEAU. It is not a question merely of interpretation.

Mr. JONES. I understand the original amendment the gentleman offered could not possibly have been agreed to, because it would make it a condition that the Secretary must, in the manner proposed, condition all the payments. This would take an army as large as Hitler's to enforce. It was conditioned on land not being used for any of these purposes. It was made mandatory. Now, the Secretary may use any kind of soil-conservation plans he wants to insofar as crops are concerned.

This is my interpretation of the substitute: In carrying out the provisions of this section the Secretary shall, so far as practical, assist voluntary growing of soil-improving or erosion-preventing crops for the purpose of soil building but not for commercial use. In other words, the soil-building crops are to be used primarily for soil building rather than for commercial use. It would be the Secretary's duty primarily and insofar as practicable to use the whole thing for the purpose of rebuilding the soil. If he could do this without the use of the crops in commerce it would be wise for him to do so.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. I do not conceive that this is a mandatory provision forbidding grass or any of the crops to be used in any fashion at all; but that he shall, insofar as practical, adopt a policy that will make it a soil-conservation use rather than a commercial use. I think, insofar as this can be done, it should be done. But I do not want a compulsory interpretation put on this language that the Secretary cannot permit any of these crops to be used or that if a cow happened to break into a field and graze on some of the grass she cannot be sold. Surely the gentleman would not go so far as that.

Mr. BOILEAU. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: If the Secretary concludes that it is a practical thing to provide for the use of lands, either by plowing under cover crops or fallowing it, resting it, if he concludes that this is a practical way to conserve the soil, would not the gentleman then agree that he should use every power he has to see that the farmers do not use such lands for commercial purposes?

Mr. JONES. It would be his duty, if that were the best way to preserve the soil, to use that method if it is administratively practical.

Mr. BOILEAU. I appreciate that.

Mr. JONES. But, according to my interpretation, this is far removed from the gentleman's original proposal; and if we cannot reach some agreement as to interpretation or

modify this amendment, I cannot support it. I suggested this language at one time:

That the Secretary shall, insofar as practical, encourage the use of soil-building and soil-conservation crops rather than soil-depleting commercial crops.

This is the language I would like to see in the amendment. I am perfectly willing to go this far. I think it would be clearly out of the picture to adopt an amendment susceptible of the interpretation placed upon this one by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the gentleman from Texas that my understanding with the gentleman was that this amendment would be agreed to. I understood the gentleman from Texas agreed to this language. It is language written by himself.

Mr. JONES. I do not believe my colleagues will agree to the amendment in the light of the gentleman's interpretation.

Mr. BOILEAU. It is just a question of interpretation. The gentleman has stated his interpretation, and I have given my interpretation of it.

Mr. JONES. Insofar as the amendment makes this provision mandatory, I think it would run right into the same trouble in Supreme Court and the issue would be raised.

Mr. BOILEAU. I would like to know whether the gentleman is going to support the amendment as submitted.

Mr. JONES. I wish the gentleman would withdraw it to see if we cannot agree upon the language of the amendment.

Mr. BOILEAU. I will be glad to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. JONES. And I will do all I can to protect the gentleman's right to offer his original amendment.

Mr. BOILEAU. With this understanding: So the gentleman will not doubt my good faith in the matter, and that the gentleman may understand my position in the matter clearly, I shall presently ask consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has asked unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. I shall object and offer as a substitute for the amendment which he has offered the original amendment offered by the gentleman.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Do I gather from the explanation of the chairman of the Agricultural Committee that the purpose of this bill is to allow farmers to be paid to take land out of the production of certain crops and still raise upon that land other crops which they may sell and get paid a double amount unless the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin is adopted?

Mr. BOILEAU. I do not want to say what the contention of the chairman of the Agricultural Committee is. But I hope the Members will grant my request to withdraw this amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. The purpose of his amendment is to prevent the competitive use of lands that are planted to soil-building crops?

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman is correct. If the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] and I can agree on language, we probably will be able to present an amendment which will be satisfactory.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think it has been clearly demonstrated by the arguments heretofore made that the purpose of the chairman of the Agricultural Committee is to have no language in this bill that will accomplish the purpose sought by the original Boileau amendment. We have just been told by the chairman of the Agricultural Committee that he never intended this language to mean what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU] thinks it means. Therefore, it seems to me that we who are interested in the dairy industry have but

one thing to do, and that is to go back to language about which there is absolutely no question.

Mr. Chairman, the criticism we receive from the country today is that we place upon statute books legislation which is subject to most any kind of interpretation. In the language which has just been suggested we are trying to create a doubt, we are endeavoring to befog the issue, and trying to state something that may be interpreted in several ways. I conceive it to be the duty of the Members of this Congress to pass clear, concise, readable, understandable, potential legislation. With all due respect to my good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU], who has fought so long and so hard for this principle, I believe, in agreeing to the language which the chairman of the Agricultural Committee has prepared, that he is waiving all the protection which he is seeking on behalf of the dairy interests. This bill already includes everything in this amendment which has just been presented, with the exception of the last 5 or 6 words. The amendment is innocuous. The original Boileau amendment has some force. It will accomplish something.

The regular order was demanded.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU] to withdraw his amendment?

There was no objection.

The amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I know both the gentleman from Wisconsin and I acted in good faith, but one of us misconstrued the language and our interpretations do not agree. I want to state that if we cannot agree on language, I hope the gentleman will have opportunity to offer the amendment as he originally drafted it and will be accorded sufficient time to discuss it in full.

Mr. BOILEAU. We did agree on language, but we did not agree on an interpretation.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. If this is in reality intended as a conservation measure—and I take it that is the intent—does not the chairman know that if the Government pays out of the Treasury for soil-conserving crops, like soybeans, the farmers should be required to plow it under and restore soil fertility that much quicker?

Mr. JONES. Of course, the major purpose of the bill is conservation of the soil and its rebuilding. I do not think it is possible without endangering the entire bill to have a mandatory provision in here. I am very earnestly in favor of a policy that will discourage in every possible way the use of this land on a commercial basis. I simply want the Secretary to use every practical means to discourage the use of the soil for planting depleting crops and encourage the use of soil-building crops and practices. I will go as far as I can in that direction, but I am not willing to agree to a mandatory provision that would fly right into the face of the Supreme Court decision.

Mr. MAY. The point I am trying to make is this: Just a few years ago the Department of Agriculture got out a bulletin in which they demonstrated that the plowing under of one leguminous crop would produce more fertility than the taking off of five crops.

Mr. JONES. I hope they may be shown the advantage of using the best soil-conserving methods. I think if we could with some other language accomplish the same purpose, it would go a long ways toward accomplishing the result.

Mr. MAY. Just one thing further, and this is based on my own experience. I have tried it. I have planted, say, whippoorwill cowpeas in May and plowed them under in September. This protects the soil all the time.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I notice some language here that states "but not for commercial production, grazing or forage." The last three words are stricken out, and I see written in

with a pencil the word "use." May I ask my colleague what difference he thinks that makes? For the life of me I cannot see there is any difference at all.

Mr. JONES. That is not the basis of the discussion. I do not think that it makes much difference.

Mr. RAYBURN. Then, I want to ask the gentleman another question.

Mr. BOILEAU. That was done by agreement with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. We are not discussing that matter.

Mr. RAYBURN. The question is on the interpretation of this language. Now, for what purpose can the crops that are planted on this land be used under this language?

Mr. JONES. They can be used for any purpose, but it is his duty to assist in the voluntary growing of soil-improving or erosion-preventing crops for the purpose of soil rebuilding, rather than for commercial use, and in carrying this out he shall assist in the soil rebuilding and not particularly assist in the commercial use.

Mr. RAYBURN. Of course, my colleague knows so much more about this than I do—

Mr. JONES. This language was hurriedly prepared, and I, perhaps, did not make it as clear as it should be.

Mr. RAYBURN. But if I were interpreting the language, I would say that he could not even graze a cow on such land and then sell the cow.

Mr. O'MALLEY. And that is exactly the reason for the amendment.

Mr. RAYBURN. I could not raise one of my dairy cows and then sell the milk.

Mr. BOILEAU. Not if the Secretary interprets the language according to my views.

Mr. JONES. If that is to be the interpretation, in accordance with my statement, I shall vote for the amendment myself, but I cannot urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. BOILEAU. In view of the gentleman's statement that he will vote for it but cannot urge his colleagues to do so, for one, I am willing gladly to release him from the agreement and with the gentleman's consent I shall introduce the amendment as originally prepared.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I do this not to make any remarks but I want to get what is in the mind of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman will permit, here is the reason for my interpretation, which may be wrong. We provide certain mandatory conditions about the land at one place. What I was getting at, and what I thought this language means, is that the Secretary should assist in a sympathetic and in every practical way in encouraging the growth of these noncommercial crops and discourage the growth of commercial crops, or not encourage the growth of commercial crops. However, this is not in the mandatory amendment, and does not force the Secretary to do this as I read it. I appreciate the generous release which the gentleman from Wisconsin has given me.

Mr. BOILEAU. I thank the chairman for his courtesy in this respect, and at the proper time shall offer my amendment.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. No; I want to interrogate the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU] with respect to his view of the amendment. If it means what I understand him to say it means, then, of course, it is another matter altogether, and I could not vote for it at all.

Let me ask the gentleman the question again, as there was some confusion a moment ago. Suppose I take out of production 40 acres of land under this language—

Mr. BOILEAU. Does the gentleman mean under the amendment I have withdrawn, or under the amendment that is in the Record and that I now propose to offer?

Mr. RAYBURN. What is in the gentleman's mind when he offers the amendment. Is it the gentleman's interpreta-

tion, if he gets his language in the bill, that I cannot use that 40 acres at all except to terrace and plant some kind of crop that I will turn under the ground to build up my soil?

Mr. BOILEAU. No; the gentleman is not accurate. If the amendment that I propose to offer is adopted, it will provide that any farmer who receives money from the Federal Government for taking land out of the production of soil-depleting crops shall use such lands only for the purpose of building up the soil, preventing erosion, or planting crops that will accomplish such purposes, plowing them under, letting them lie fallow, resting them, but he cannot harvest such crops for sale, nor can he feed livestock for sale. These lands could not be used to graze or pasture livestock for sale, or the products of which are intended for sale. In other words, he can use such lands for his own use to build up his own standard of living, to provide for a cow, if you please, to furnish milk for his own family, to raise vegetables, but, generally speaking, this land for which he is being paid money by the Federal Government to rebuild the soil and prevent erosion could not be used to compete commercially with the producers of any other agricultural commodities.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think the gentleman makes himself very clear.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Does the gentleman believe in his own mind that without the Boileau amendment a farmer under this bill can be paid for taking his land out of crop production and still raise on it other things that he can sell and get more money from?

Mr. RAYBURN. I am not qualified to answer that question. I am trying to get the position of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU].

Mr. O'MALLEY. Does the gentleman believe the Boileau amendment will prevent that?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Does the gentleman believe the Boileau amendment will prevent a farmer who is receiving payment for land he takes out of production from raising crops on it that he can sell in the market?

Mr. RAYBURN. I certainly do.

Mr. O'MALLEY. The gentleman believes the Boileau amendment will do that?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Then what is unfair about it? Should the farmer be paid twice?

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I now desire to offer the amendment that I sent to the Clerk's desk yesterday afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOILEAU to the substitute amendment: On page 6, line 20, of the amendment, strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "and any payment or grant of other aid which is conditioned, in whole or in part, upon the growth of soil-restoration, soil-conservation, or erosion-preventing crops on any land, or any change in the kind of crop to be grown on any land, shall be subject to the further condition that no crops intended for sale be harvested from, and no livestock, intended for sale, or the products of which are intended for sale, be grazed or pastured on such land."

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, would it be proper now to have some agreement as to time on this amendment?

Mr. BOILEAU. Yes.

Mr. JONES. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 40 minutes, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin and one-half by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Reserving the right to object, I reserve the right to object to make this statement: I am going

to object to more than 20 minutes, because we have consumed half an hour already on this same subject.

Mr. JONES. I hope the gentleman will not object. I regret the extension of time as much as he does, but this was agreed to as a matter of compromise.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat amazed at the turn that this debate has taken. I do not believe that there is any secret about the situation that has arisen here. Certain Members of the House interested in the Boileau amendment accepted a substitute offered by the chairman to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. The amendment was drawn by the distinguished chairman, and it was agreed upon by those concerned in this situation. The gentleman from Texas wished by the language of the substitute amendment to protect the farmers not helped by this legislation. I will say that from my interpretation of it the chairman of the committee intended to be fair, but certain leaders of his own party from the South have browbeaten him into withdrawing the original language and have sought at this stage to put into this discussion weasel words which would destroy the purpose of this mutual agreement.

It seems to me that selfishness, the influence of section, and misuse of political power was never more apparent than it is in this situation.

What is this bill? This bill is a soil-conservation bill. The Chairman knows that. Some of the leadership on the Democratic side do not seem to know it. The farmer is to be paid for taking 25,000,000 acres of land out of production. All we ask is that he shall not put that land into competing crops. The Boileau amendment now pending will prevent the cotton farmer, who has received more than \$700,000,000 out of the Treasury during this administration, from going into dairying. Soil conservation means that the land lie fallow and be at rest. Certain gentlemen on this side contend that the land so withdrawn should be in use. In other words, they want the farmers of their regions to have their cake and eat it, too. I submit that that is brutality in the last degree so far as legislation is concerned. Five hundred million dollars is to be appropriated by this bill for protecting the future of America by soil conservation. Soil conservation means that the land shall be at rest and be planted to appropriate crops. If those crops are removed from the land, the future of America is not conserved and the soil is not conserved, and this bill, of doubtful constitutionality, is headed for a certain debacle in the United States Supreme Court. This provision—the Boileau amendment—written into the bill will strengthen its constitutionality. It will insure that these 25,000,000 acres are to be conserved for future generations, and it will appeal to the Supreme Court as a real and not a specious conservation measure. And so I say to you, gentlemen of the House, from whatever section you come, if you are thinking in terms of the future America and not of your own group and your own locality, you will support the Boileau amendment, because that amendment will strengthen and not weaken the constitutionality of the bill. The adoption of this amendment will also insure fair treatment for the dairyman of the North and Central West. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this confusion that has arisen is all my fault. I have had a good many things on my desk, and I still have my interpretation of the measure, but so many disagree with me that I am willing to defer to their judgment. The situation arose in this way: Here is what I had intended to submit, and I dictated it in my office:

The Secretary, in administering this section, shall in every practical way encourage and provide for soil conserving and soil rebuilding crops and practices rather than soil-depleting commercial crops.

I asked the drafting service to draft that idea. I did not look over it as carefully as I might. He drafted it in three different forms, which I submitted to Mr. BOILEAU. I had no thought of it being interpreted as a mandatory provision. I thought we could go this far, saying he should encourage the one and not the other. However, that is neither here nor there. It hurts me to have a man make the charge that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN] has just made, because if there is anything that I have taken a pride in it is in being honest with this House. [Applause.]

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I repeat, there is one thing that I have always taken pride in, and that is my integrity, and I say to the gentleman that any pressure from anyone has no effect upon me. I do what I honestly think is right. This was the idea which I dictated and which I expected to include. The original amendment is absolutely impossible, in my judgment. If a cow should break into a pasture, the farmer could not get any payment.

That amendment conditions all payment upon the farmer in using any of this. That is an entirely different thing from either of these amendments, in my judgment. He could not get any payment. The Secretary in these millions of payments would have to pass on whether or not the farmer had violated any of these provisions. It would take an army as large as Hitler's to carry out such a provision. It is utterly unworkable in every possible way. In addition to that, it puts a mandatory provision on the Secretary which, I think, is unconstitutional. I believe that the dairymen are protected in this bill all the way through, and this was the thought I had in mind, and I honestly hoped the policy would be carried out. I would not object to its being put in the bill. If the interpretation I place upon it is wrong, I am sorry, and it has been my mistake; but I make no apology for my conduct. I want to put in the RECORD at this point a statement made by Secretary Wallace and a statement made by Mr. Chester Davis.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statements referred to are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, D. C., February 21, 1936.

Hon. MARVIN JONES,  
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. JONES: Remarks made in the House of Representatives indicate that some Members have a misconception of my attitude and that of the Department of Agriculture toward the dairy industry. These Members seem to have the impression that we are concerned about all of agriculture except the dairy industry. I would like to make it clear once and for all that I regard the welfare of the dairy industry as just as important as the welfare of any branch of agriculture.

Some Members have expressed the fear that the new farm bill might work out to the disadvantage of commercial dairymen. This fear apparently is based upon their belief that the shifting of lands from production of surplus crops which deplete fertility into soil-building legumes and grasses would result in increased competition for the commercial dairy regions.

My considered opinion is that the dairy industry would not be harmed, but, on the contrary, would benefit greatly from the soil-conservation program contemplated by the new farm bill. I will not attempt here to enter into an extended discussion of the economic factors involved. But I do wish to point out that (1) the volume of livestock products, including dairy products, is dependent primarily upon the amount of feed units available, and land in grain produces one-third to one-half more feed units than land in grasses or legumes; (2) farmers who have not been used to milking cows do not usually go into commercial dairying unless forced to do so by low prices for products they have been accustomed to raise; (3) if the over-all capacity of the American farm plant is brought more nearly into balance with total demand for food and fiber, all farm products, including dairy products, will feel the beneficial effects of strengthened price levels. Experience of the past 3 years and the improvement in the dairy and beef cattle industries which accompanied the adjustment programs lends substantial weight to this reasoning.

It is also important to remember that the proposed new program is more general in nature than the commodity programs were and that increased opportunities will be afforded for dairy farmers to participate.

Of course, actual experience in administration will be the real test of the new farm program. If it should turn out that, contrary to our expectations, dairy production did tend to increase more rapidly than consumers' ability to buy and, especially in flush seasons, price declines resulted, then positive corrective steps can and will be employed. If circumstances warrant, the Government

would have adequate authority to step into the market with purchases of dairy products for relief distribution.

Such purchases, by taking excessive supplies out of the commercial market, would not only help to sustain dairy prices but would provide this nutritious food to families who otherwise could not afford it. Leaders in the dairy industry have for years vigorously opposed any policies of scarcity and have expressed the belief that the way out for their industry lay rather in encouragement of consumption.

I feel strongly that in planning to conserve and improve the soil resources the new farm program is soundly conceived, not only in the interests of agriculture but in the national interest as well. And if it should be my responsibility to administer this program I will do everything in my power to see that it is carried out with fairness and justice to all farm groups.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. WALLACE, *Secretary.*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1936.

HON. MARVIN JONES,  
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,  
House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. JONES: My attention has been called to the fact that in the progress of the debate on the pending soil-conservation amendment, statements have been made to the effect that, when I met with your committee to discuss the bill's provisions, I had advised the committee that I expected there would be an increase in dairy production as the result of the new soil-conservation program.

My comment on this point was in response to a question by Congressman ANDRESEN, who asked me, as I recall it, if I did not believe the operation of the bill would result in increased output of dairy products. While I am not able to reconstruct the exact language, I remember very clearly the substance of what I told the committee, which was:

"That, in the judgment of feed and dairy experts, the volume of animal products produced for market is generally governed by the number of feed units produced; that cultivation of land for feed grain crops produces many more feed units per acre than are produced when the land is in legumes or grass, so that a shift from the production of corn and other feed grains to grass and legumes would, in the judgment of experts like Dr. O. E. Reed, of the Bureau of Dairy Industry, result in reducing rather than increasing the total output of livestock products."

I then stated that, even assuming these men are mistaken and that, as a result of the program, an increase in the output of dairy products took place, Congress had already given the Department of Agriculture funds and authority to deal with the situation in such a way that dairy producers would not suffer. I mentioned the provisions of section 32 and of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and its appropriation section particularly, pointing out as an illustration of how these powers would be used, the purchases of dairy products for relief distribution which had already taken place. The figures were:

	Pounds
Butter .....	69, 016, 491.98
Cheese .....	18, 112, 278.13
Dry milk solids .....	15, 842, 262.57
Evaporated milk .....	47, 026, 784.75

I told the committee that in my opinion there would be no hesitation in using these powers to hold support under butterfat prices and that increased consumption of dairy products in this country, if it could be brought about without depressing dairy prices, would be a good thing for the United States, since from the dietary standpoint we consume in this country less milk and its products than we should.

I believe the foregoing represents accurately what I said before the committee, just as it sets forth my present views.

Sincerely yours,

CHESTER C. DAVIS, *Administrator.*

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I am sorry I cannot yield; the time is so short. This statement was made by Department officials before the Committee on Agriculture and gives their assurance that they expect to take care of the dairy interests in every practical way. I think they show that the interpretation which I put on the statement in my speech yesterday was a correct one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I have been finding a great deal of difficulty with myself in getting around to the point where I can vote for this measure. I must say that I have not gotten exactly to that point yet, although I am getting very close to it if the pending amendment is adopted; otherwise I am no nearer a decision than before.

As a matter of common knowledge and general understanding among the membership of this House, the question

of legislation affecting the farming interests of this country is the character of legislation that the Congress is generally more nearly uniform in agreeing to than any other character of legislation that comes before us. The reason for that is that it is recognized by everyone that the success and prosperity of the farmer is essential to the welfare of this country.

I think the basic principle was well stated, much better stated than I can state it, by the distinguished William Jennings Bryan more than 30 years ago, when he said:

You may burn down your great cities and leave us our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic; but destroy our farms and grass will grow in the streets of every city in this country.

That is the philosophy upon which legislation ought to be based. I think this bill is an honest effort to conserve the soil and make it possible for the farmers to prosper. By way of an answer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN], let me say that I was having my difficulties in agreeing to this bill, but the chairman of this committee has been so manifestly fair in his discussion upon the floor of the House that he has almost whipped me into line with his fairness. I do not think the criticism he has received upon the floor of this House is at all justified. [Applause.] The amendment that was adopted today which protects the consumer against exorbitant prices has gotten me by one of my chief difficulties. With reference to the amendment that is now pending, and for which I expect to vote, I must say that if the question of mandatory legislation, as far as the Secretary of Agriculture is concerned, is to be raised on this amendment, it ought to be raised on the entire bill, because I have never read a piece of legislation that creates such despotic and unlimited power in the hands of one man in this country. Under the permanent features which attempts to get by the recent decision of the Supreme Court on the question of States' rights, no State can enact any law or adopt any plan that can be put into effect unless it conforms to the whims of a Washington bureaucrat. It puts the farmer on a dole and ties the hands of the States. I challenge any man on the floor of this House to show the contrary. If you are going to give a farmer the right to plant a legume crop as a fertilizer upon 40 acres of land, I say the farmer's crop ought to be plowed under in order to fertilize the soil. [Applause.] A few years ago the Department of Agriculture put out a bulletin advising farmers to plant and plow under leguminous crops as a means of fertilizing and conserving the soil, and if this is a real conservation measure and not a simple subsidy, the Boileau amendment should be adopted.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer the statement that I dictated this morning as a substitute for this amendment, and to have it read, not to be taken out of the time, so that it may be before the body at the same time.

Mr. BOILEAU. Reserving the right to object, do you ask unanimous consent, or do you offer that as an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. JONES. No. I ask unanimous consent that it may be read and not taken out of my time.

Mr. BOILEAU. To be read, but not offered?

Mr. JONES. To be offered at the time this comes to a vote. I will offer it as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. JONES, offered for information: On page 6, after the period in line 15, insert "The Secretary, in administering this section, shall, in every practical way, encourage and provide for soil-conserving and soil-rebuilding crops and practices rather than soil-depleting commercial crops."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I shall consume all the 5 minutes that has been yielded to me; but, despite any differences of opinion that we may have had with reference to the interpretation of the amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin and subsequently withdrawn, as far as the amendment now

actually pending before the Committee is concerned, I want to call the attention of the membership of this Committee, particularly the lawyers, to the fact that if we adopt the amendment now offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, in the light of the specific interpretation placed upon the A. A. A. bill by the Supreme Court of the United States, you might just as well not pass any farm-relief bill. I think I measure my words when I make that statement. Why do I say it? If you will read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, it undertakes in definite, direct, and specific terms to regulate agriculture or some phase of agriculture. The language of the amendment reads:

Or any change in the kind of crop to be grown on any land shall be subject to the further condition that no crops intended for sale be harvested from, and no livestock intended for sale, or the products of which are intended for sale, be grazed or pastured on such land.

A direct, determinate, specific condition.

What did the Supreme Court of the United States say as to that? We must be bound by that mandate of the highest Court of the land, however some of us may differ with its conclusions. I read a brief extract from what I regard as the very heart of the opinion in that case:

The same proposition otherwise stated is that powers not granted are prohibited. None to regulate agricultural production is given. Therefore legislation by Congress for that purpose is forbidden.

If you vote for this amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, you do it deliberately, with your eyes wide open, with this specific prohibition, with the words of the Supreme Court of the United States immediately before you, and you do a vain thing that will necessarily, in my deliberate opinion, mean that you are passing a bill that cannot be sustained by the highest Court of the land. Now, can you afford to do that? We may have honest differences of opinion, but if you want an agricultural bill, you certainly cannot afford to vote for this amendment. I urge you, upon the ground I have stated, regardless of other considerations that might enter into it, not to do a thing of that sort deliberately.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Briefly.

Mr. MAY. I want to ask if this provision is any more mandatory than the effect of the other provisions that the Secretary of Agriculture is empowered with?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Undoubtedly. If the gentleman will read the four corners of this bill, as I have endeavored to read them, he will find there is nothing mandatory, there are no contractual obligations imposed upon any farmer. I do not know whether this would stand the test of the Supreme Court, but it seems to me the committee has removed as far as it is humanly possible every legal obstacle as a basis for constitutional destruction, and I hope this amendment will be voted down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Sisson] 3 minutes.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of reluctance and hesitation that I put myself in the light of being presumptuous enough to differ with the very able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture on a matter affecting that great industry. I have the highest respect for both his integrity and his ability. It is with equal reluctance that I differ or appear to differ with our able and distinguished majority leader. I think he is just as good a lawyer as any member of the highest Court in this country. [Applause.] But I doubt that he can guess any better. I am sure the majority leader feels that the Bankhead Cotton Act was constitutional or he would not have proposed it to this body; he has too much integrity and too much regard for his position as a lawmaker. He guessed wrong on the Bankhead Cotton Act; not as to its constitutionality, for I believe it was clearly a constitutional exercise of our power under the welfare clause. He guessed wrong as to what the judges would say about it. I say this not in criticism of him, for no man or group of men can tell in advance what the judges are going to say on a so-called constitutional question. If he guessed

wrong then, he may be guessing wrong now. Frankly, while it is presumptuous for me to oppose myself to him as an authority on the Constitution, it seems to me clear that with the Boileau amendment added to the bill it will be more truly a conservation bill than it would be without. [Applause.]

May I say just this one thing further and then I am through: The dairymen of the State of New York, the dairymen of the whole Northeast believe, whether rightly or wrongly—and I think they have some ground for their apprehension—that this bill is going to be very injurious to them at least without the addition of the Boileau amendment; and I am saying this particularly for the benefit of my Democratic colleagues.

I am going to support the Boileau amendment and, as I said yesterday, unless this amendment is adopted I shall be compelled, representing the interests of my own section, to vote against the bill. I am willing to do everything possible for any other section of the country, but I am not willing to do something for another section solely at the expense, the detriment, and the tearing down of the greatest industry of the farmers in my section. Without the Boileau amendment I shall vote against the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mitchell].

Mr. MITCHELL of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, no bill has been brought to the floor of this House since I have been a Member of this body that I have been more interested in than the bill now being considered. This bill has in its language the power to help nine-tenths of my people, the group I represent, because we are largely an agricultural people. I am unwilling to jeopardize the good that can be realized in this bill by attaching to it any amendment that will perhaps cause it to be declared unconstitutional, thus robbing us of all the benefits the bill promises.

I know what agriculture in this country has suffered. Not only was I reared on a farm but for many years I was president of an agricultural school; and I believe, as I have heard expressed on this floor many times, that the progress of this country is based more upon agriculture than upon any other single industry. I do not believe we ought to jeopardize the good that can be realized from this legislation by attaching to it an amendment that would help one section of the country at the expense of another.

It has not been proven that this bill will injure dairying; it is only an idea in the mind of gentlemen who come from dairy districts, and it has been very interesting to me to notice that most of the opposition comes from Members who live in the cities. I have the deepest sympathy for every phase of agriculture, and I should not like to have a part in or be a party to passing any legislation that would injure any part of this industry, but I do not believe the bill will do that. I believe the picture as to the injury that will come to dairying if we pass this bill in its original form is far overdrawn. For my part, to keep from destroying the usefulness this bill promises, I am going to vote against the amendment and for the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Andresen].

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry the chairman of our committee did not take the time to read the letters received from the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Act so that we could learn their present opinion as to the effect upon the dairy industry of this legislation, for in the committee it was definitely stated by both gentlemen that the dairy industry would naturally be expanded as a result of this program. If they now have a different opinion, and if they do not intend to encourage expansion of the dairy and livestock industry, then I think we should have their communications read so that we can have an understanding of their attitude. The Members on this side, and particularly myself, regard farm legislation as one of the most important problems before Congress in this or any other session. I am for farm legislation. I want a program that we can agree on that will be of benefit to agriculture and not to the detriment of any particular group in our great agricultural industry. So if our chairman in his own time will let the House know how

the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Act now stand on this question, I am sure he will be contributing something that may clear up the fog surrounding this situation in the minds of Members representing the dairy sections; and we may be able to get together on an amendment to take care of the dairy sections.

I thought we had harmony here in the construction of an amendment that would take the place of the Boileau amendment. I concurred in the chairman's suggestion because I felt he was in sympathy with the idea of giving equality to all of agriculture. I am sorry he has changed his mind and the minds of certain gentlemen on the other side of the aisle.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the two letters I hold in my hand may be read by the Clerk, without being taken out of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I object at this time.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I am sure there is not anyone here who wants to do anything injurious to the dairy industry of this country. I do not; and I trust that the gentlemen who are interested in dairying, and who have introduced this amendment in order to protect the interests of dairying, will not be so insistent upon their point that, in order to get this protection for dairying, they would destroy a lot of our small farmers out through the Middle West and the Southwest who farm small acreages put to cash crops. If they are to participate under this program and be benefited by it, when they take these acres out of production and place them to the planting of legumes or some other fertility building product, they must of necessity be able to at least graze their milk cows on that piece of land which they have taken out of the production of cash crops. For the life of me I cannot see why, with all the wisdom in this House, it is not possible to prepare an amendment here which will do the thing that they want to do and yet not destroy a lot of the fellows about whom I am talking, so that these small farmers who have one or two milk cows and use the milk for their own consumption and maybe sell a quart or two occasionally, will not be deprived of the use of the land which they take out of production.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'MALLEY].

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely surprised at this time that the opponents of the Boileau amendment should bring up the question of constitutionality in connection with this amendment. I am surprised at that attitude, in view of the fact that our own Chief Executive has stated that we should not let doubt as to the constitutionality of a bill prevent us from passing good legislation. [Applause.]

It has been admitted by the opponents of the Boileau amendment that a farmer may receive payment from this Government for land which he takes out of production so far as concerns certain kinds of crops, but he may still produce upon that land other crops and receive payment by the sale of these crops. I submit that is absolutely unfair. If the Government is going to pay the farmers in certain sections of the country for taking land out of production, that should be sufficient for the farmer, particularly when the money is going to come from the taxpayers of other sections of the country.

If the Boileau amendment is rejected by this body, I hope my State will not stand idly by and let our dairy industry be wiped out. If this bill is passed without the Boileau amendment, I trust the executive authorities of my State will be the first to show the courage to take the proper steps to challenge the constitutionality of a bill which threatens the livelihood of one group of farmers to benefit another group and carries to a destructive end the vicious and atheistic theory of scarcity. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, first I want to take this opportunity to thank the membership of this House for granting \$2,000,000 to be used to control dust storms in the area commonly known as the dust bowl, which is situated in my district. A year ago I started trying to get funds to allow farmers to list their fields to prevent blowing.

My people that live in this district have borne the scourge of 5 years of droughts and dust storms. They are capable, brave, and courageous, but they have reached the limit of their own resources, and the Congress, by granting this \$2,000,000, has allowed these farmers to combat these terrible dust storms by listing their ground. This will mean that they will be able to save what wheat they have from destruction. It will mean some measure of relief from the choking dust that has impaired their health. It will mean protection for grazing land and should limit the dust that is being deposited on the grass and ruining it for animal use. It will mean protection to the merchants from having their stocks of goods ruined by dust. It will mean protection to the housewife, who, during the dust storms, found the most spotless household covered with a layer of dust. I am grateful to the Congress for recognizing these dust storms as being a calamity comparable to a disastrous fire, earthquake, or flood, and I fully believe that the \$2,000,000 granted in this bill will in a measure alleviate these conditions.

Now, as to the amendment introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU], I have only this statement to make:

Any farmer will realize that 50,000,000 acres planted to grass or the legumes will not produce as much beef or butter products as 50,000,000 acres in corn, wheat, or other grain products. The argument is absurd on the face of it. You cannot produce more dairy products and more beef by taking out grain and forage crops and putting in grass.

The adoption of this amendment would mean that no farmer could raise any crops planted on the acres he is attempting to rebuild. Such a system would be unworkable and be a hardship to the farmers of my district and would make cooperation in this program impossible. Almost every farmer in my district has a few milk cows and markets butter-fat from these cows. I do not believe that the pasture derived from soil-building crops should be entirely consumed or used for commercial purposes, but under the amendment offered by Mr. BOILEAU not even a calf could be turned in these fields without depriving the farmer of the benefits of the act. In many parts of my district legumes will not grow. The planting of sorghum, while considered a soil-depletion crop, if grazed in moderation would do more to restore this type of soil than legumes.

Thus, I hope the Committee votes down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FIESINGER].

Mr. FIESINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in this bill, although there are many things about it I do not like. I have been particularly interested in the Boileau amendment, and have endeavored to listen attentively to the debate. I went to see the gentleman from Wisconsin personally about the matter. Then I heard the chairman of the Agricultural Committee say upon the floor of this House that he objected to the Boileau amendment, because he thought it would make the entire bill vulnerable to attack under the Constitution of the United States.

As I stated, I have listened to all this argument, and I cannot understand the justification for the point of view of unconstitutionality. I am yet, however, considerably in the dark for the reason that we do not know just how this bill is going to be carried out by the Secretary of Agriculture. Some people here have said "He cannot make a contract." It would seem to me that he cannot work it out without making a contract and if a contract has to be made it seems to me there can be no objection to the insertion of a condition in that contract such as the Boileau amendment provides. I am not so particularly interested, and my district is not generally interested, in the dairying business, although there are many dairy farmers therein who have important interests. However, I do stand upon the proposition that

we should not take land out of use and then put that land to a use that will be competitive with other business in the country. [Applause.] I stand upon that principle, and I have a reason—a broader reason—for that position. I think one of the objections to the A. A. A. was that we took certain lands out of cultivation and then put those same lands into cultivation of other things which came into competition. As a result, we got into a system of logrolling here in the House.

I think this is a most pernicious way to legislate, and therefore I wonder if we cannot possibly get some kind of adjustment on this proposition so the Secretary of Agriculture may work it out.

I shall vote for the bill, but I shall also vote to recommit in an effort to have the Boileau amendment included, for the reasons I have stated, although I should have preferred a compromise. I do not share the misgivings of some gentlemen here that the bill would be unconstitutional with the Boileau amendment included any more than without it, and I believe that this bill will finally meet the constitutional test, otherwise I would not vote for it. Because of trade barriers, the farmers of this country have been unjustly dealt with, and it is high time we even the score, and the city man is vitally interested in this simple justice, because unless the farmer is put on an equality with industry there can be no prosperity in the United States worthy of the name. The bill has been amended so as to protect the consumer; and if the administration under the bill is anywhere near as good as the intent of Congress to make it a good bill and help the farmer, it seems everyone should be satisfied.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE].

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time to call the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU] to an interpretation that the language of his amendment is subject to, which I do not believe he intends.

The principal soil-building crops are alfalfa and clover. They are used for hay and at the same time they are valuable for building up the soil. The language of this amendment prohibits the raising of crops for sale, not for use, but prohibits the use of crops for grazing purposes for livestock.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes, the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, a good deal of the debate with reference to this amendment has been with reference to its constitutionality.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the distinguished majority leader, on yesterday quoted a sentence or two from the decision of the Supreme Court in the Butler case. The gentleman quoted this language, claiming it was conclusive evidence that this particular amendment is unconstitutional. I want to quote what I think is the same language he quoted, at least I am quoting from the same decision of the Supreme Court:

The same proposition otherwise stated is that powers not granted are prohibited. None to regulate agricultural production is given, and therefore legislation by Congress for that purpose is forbidden.

The gentleman used this language as an argument that the amendment I have offered is unconstitutional. I may say to the gentleman from Alabama and to the membership of this House that this bill gives the Secretary of Agriculture the power to do everything that my amendment says he shall do. There is no difference in my amendment and the provisions of the bill, except the bill as it is now written authorizes him, if he sees fit, to make these conditions upon payments, and the amendment I offer says he must make these conditions before payment is made.

I have talked with distinguished lawyers in this body, and I have talked with distinguished constitutional lawyers who, in this Committee, on other occasions, have been accepted as authority, and they say this amendment does not under any circumstances add to the unconstitutionality of the bill.

There is no justification for a statement that this amendment would invalidate the act. If this bill is constitutional, certainly it would not be considered unconstitutional if we provided that the Secretary shall do the thing that we now say he may do.

To my mind such an argument is ridiculous. To my mind there is no justification for an attack against this amendment on the ground that it is unconstitutional, unless you are willing to admit that the bill itself violates the Constitution. [Applause.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, on this particular occasion I regret very much to find myself in direct opposition to my distinguished young friend from Wisconsin, particularly with reference to his last statement as to the constitutionality of this bill.

An understanding of this measure is requisite before one can put it alongside the Constitution, which is the method, according to the Supreme Court, of deciding whether or not an act conforms with that instrument.

This is not a crop-production control measure. This is a soil-erosion, soil-conservation, and soil-rebuilding measure. There is nothing in this measure that indicates under the powers granted to the Secretary that he should recommend anything more than a shift in soil usage, or a shift in crop to be planted on the acreage of the farms of the country.

Of course, those who entertain the idea that this is still a bewhiskered Mephisto, as I said on yesterday, in the guise of a reenactment of the A. A. A., with its corn-hog contracts, and so forth, if you please, from which, in my distinguished friend's district last year, he and others, including myself, asked relief because of its restrictive provisions preventing the use of such lands taken out of corn from being used for dairy feed for starving cattle in dry areas, are certainly mistaken.

The constitutional question involved in the gentleman's amendment to this bill is that it is a direct crop-restriction bill. The bill without such an amendment provides for the shifting of crops and a different use of such lands. The lands that are now in soil-depleting crops are taken out of such production and put in grass. With his amendment a compulsory restriction imposing control makes the bill fly in the face of the Supreme Court ruling in the A. A. A. case.

As applied to my State and the cotton-producing South and many other areas of the United States, alfalfa and other valuable legumes cannot be raised, but we still conduct a reasonable livestock and dairying business. The dairyman who raises cows always has a few to sell, just as does the ranchman and the sheepman have feeders and lambs to sell, and in the shifting use of the land under this measure I see no reason or justification for the suggestion that the dairyman in my section or the ranchman in my distinguished and able friend JIM WADSWORTH'S section should be denied the opportunity of selling a few feeders or a few lambs to those who would graze them on lands that once produced all wheat, or on land which once produced all cotton, and in this way restricted the fertility of the soil to go into the hands of future generations.

Mr. Chairman, when we go into this question and study it carefully we are confronted with this peculiar situation. Much ado is made over an amendment to this bill which, in my opinion, under a strict interpretation of parliamentary rules of procedure, would be conceded to be not germane to this measure, because the purpose of the amendment and the powers to be exercised are so widely different from the purposes to be attained and the powers to be exercised under the original bill itself.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'MALLEY) there were 101 ayes and 129 noes.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. JONES and Mr. BOILEAU.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 111 ayes and 144 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAPES moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that motion has already been voted upon and that it is dilatory.

The CHAIRMAN. Two amendments have been adopted since the other motion was offered, and so this motion is in order.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, this morning I received the following telegram:

DETROIT, MICH., February 21, 1936.

CARL E. MAPES,  
House of Representatives, Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Believe new farm bill opposed best interests Michigan farmers who practice fundamentals laid down in measure, and whose markets will be threatened by increased similar production elsewhere.

EDITOR MICHIGAN FARMER.

A few days ago I received a letter from the secretary of the Michigan State Farm Bureau, as follows:

MICHIGAN STATE FARM BUREAU,  
Lansing, Mich., February 17, 1936.

The Honorable CARL E. MAPES,  
House of Representatives, House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MAPES: A review of the soil-conservation bill, H. R. 10835, indicates that some features should have careful study and some important amendments. I understand that in the administration of the proposed legislation it is planned to take from 20,000,000 to 30,000,000 acres of cotton, tobacco, corn, wheat, and other cash crops out of production and use the land for reforestation and to grow grasses and legumes. Farmers entering into such an arrangement would receive a rental for making the change. Also, the forage so produced would be allowed to enter into the channels of trade and livestock production.

Manifestly this procedure would not only materially increase the Nation's output of dairy and livestock products in areas adapted to their production but it would also subsidize farmers in southern and other areas not adapted to livestock and dairy production to an extent which would bring these other territories into production of dairy and livestock products and still further increase our already existing surpluses.

The restoration of soil fertility and holding erosion in check is commendable, and, in my judgment, well worth the expenditure of considerable money under proper safeguards, but certainly this legislation would appear extremely dangerous unless it can be so framed as to prevent the hay and legume crops produced on such lands from adding still more to the existing distressing surpluses of dairy and livestock products. It is only logical to keep the production of such lands out of commercial and livestock channels, except perhaps in cases of dire shortage and emergency.

Furthermore, when we consider that the bill as now drawn provides that the administration of the act rests in the Secretary of Agriculture, with unlimited powers, the unbalancing of our agriculture and the resultant havoc to the interests of the farmer possible, and even probable, indicates surely that amendments should be made to safeguard these features.

At this distance I realize I do not have the background to properly appraise all features of the bill; but it also is apparent that (g) under section 7, which provides for the apportioning of the money on the basis of farm population, the value of agricultural commodities, and the acreage and productivity of the land in the respective States, should be very carefully examined to determine whether or not this is equitable to Michigan and other northern agricultural States. If this basis for apportionment is inequitable to Michigan and northern agriculture, serious harm to our farming interests would certainly result, particularly when we consider the unlimited powers granted the Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of the act.

I am writing this solely to safeguard the interests of Michigan farmers and with a view to better adapting any new legislation to the direct needs of Michigan agriculture than obtained under the recently invalidated Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Certainly a new act should take the direct interests of the Michigan farmer into consideration, just the same as those of the Corn and Cotton Belt States, and I am greatly in hopes that the considerations suggested above, and others to safeguard the administration of the act, may be included in the bill.

That legislation to carry out the main purposes of the act is seriously needed is evident to every well-informed person regarding the farm question. I have found no evidence of disagreement on this point. It is only a question of a comparatively short time before overproduction in many lines of agriculture will result in

distressingly low farm prices and consequent loss of buying power for the products of industry if a satisfactory solution is not found.

The Michigan State Farm Bureau is intensely interested in the development of a permanent and constructive program, but it can no longer acquiesce in a plan that merely permits the Michigan farmer to pick up the crumbs that fall from the legislative table.

Since the declaration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act as unconstitutional by the Supreme Court neither the board of directors nor the membership of the Michigan State Farm Bureau has had an opportunity to formulate a new policy. Nevertheless, I consider the interests of Michigan farmers involved to an extent which renders it my responsibility to write you these observations.

Yours very truly,

C. L. BRODY, Executive Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I know, these two communications represent the sentiment of the farmers in the State of Michigan in regard to this legislation. At any rate I have not received a request from any farmer in the State to support it. The vote just taken rejecting the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU] in an attempt to protect the dairy farmer is some indication of what may be expected in the administration of the law.

Mr. Chairman, this bill asks Congress to take too much on faith. It proposes, in effect, to give the Secretary of Agriculture a check of \$500,000,000 to spend as he sees fit and asks us to have faith that it will be spent wisely. The only limitation put upon him is that the money must be used for five very vague and general purposes set forth in the act, namely:

1. Preservation and improvement of soil fertility.
2. Promotion of the economic use of land.
3. Diminution of exploitation and unprofitable use of national soil resources.
4. Provision for and maintenance of a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities adequate to meet domestic and foreign consumer requirements at prices fair to both producers and consumers thereof.
5. Reestablishment and maintenance of farmers' purchasing power.

I submit that no one can get any clear or definite idea as to how the money will be spent from that language and the proponents of the legislation for the most part have quite frankly admitted that they do not know. It is left to the Secretary of Agriculture to work out a plan and to spend the money where and in such ways as he thinks best. As the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] has well said, it is up to the Secretary of Agriculture to determine whether a given State comes under it or gets any benefit out of it or not.

It is freely admitted that the success or failure of the program depends largely on the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and how the law is administered by the Department. No one knows to what crops it will be applied nor what methods will be used to put the law into effect. Not only does the bill itself fail to give us any light but the Committee on Agriculture held no hearings on the bill, so that we have no way of telling what is in the minds of those who will be called upon to administer the legislation, or what they intend to do once it becomes a law.

It is conceded that the passage of the legislation will require the raising of \$500,000,000 additional in taxation to meet the expenses of administering it. We have no idea of how that additional amount of money can be raised and are asked to have faith that it can be.

It is proposed to pay farmers in certain sections of the country to raise hay and other crops which will add to the fertility of the soil. We do that in Michigan through a rotation of crops as a matter of routine and good business, with no thought of being paid by the Government for doing it. As stated in the telegram which I have read, Michigan farmers practice the fundamentals laid down in the measure of their own accord. I wonder if it is a proper function of the Government to pay out public money for such purposes. Where will such a policy lead to? It will have a tendency to encourage a farmer to let his farm run down so that he can get some easy Government money to build it up again.

In one breath it is said that we ought to preserve as much of the A. A. A. as possible and that this legislation

will do it. In the next breath it is said it is not a crop-reduction bill at all. It is difficult to see any consistency between the theory of this legislation and that of the A. A. A. On the contrary, one is contradictory of the other. The theory of the A. A. A. was to pay for the reduction of crops. The theory of this legislation is to pay for growing crops. One is based upon the doctrine of scarcity, the other upon the doctrine of plenty. The chairman of the committee, in his very able and frank discussion of the bill yesterday, quite frankly said that he did not believe that under the temporary plan of the bill farmers could be paid directly to limit production of agricultural products.

This bill sets up practically no standard to guide the Secretary of Agriculture in the exercise of his discretion. The administration of it is left to his whim. It is an unlimited delegation of power. The bill gives no definite idea of what the legislative intent is. Under one Secretary one program might be adopted, and under another Secretary an entirely different and inconsistent one might be adopted. We are about to enter upon a political campaign. If this administration is voted out of power next November, as many confidently expect it will be, and a new Secretary of Agriculture is selected next January, what will be his program under this bill? How are farmers going to make any plans under such conditions? It will simply make confusion worse confounded. I believe it would be better to pass no legislation than to pass this makeshift without adequate consideration and without setting forth more definitely in the law itself what is to be done. If legislation is necessary, we should take time and know what we are doing before passing it.

Let me quote a paragraph from the preliminary report of the special legislative committee of the National Cooperative Council, dated February 12, 1936, which came to our desks a few days ago:

It is desirable that no hasty action be taken which might result in the enactment of a new statute which would again be found unconstitutional in whole or in part. Nothing is more disturbing to agriculture than the invalidation of legislation under which extensive organization of agricultural groups has been effected. The despair and confusion resulting from the necessity of abandoning programs because of unconstitutionality of statutes on which they are based and the consequent reorganization that must occur in large agricultural groups cause more serious and lasting damage to the cause of agriculture than would result from such delay as may be necessary to permit the formulation of a sound, workable, and constitutional plan.

That is the statement of representatives of farm organizations who have devoted their lives to the study of agricultural problems. Among the members of the board of directors of the National Cooperative Council are three very distinguished and respected leaders of agricultural organizations in Michigan, namely, Mr. E. A. Beamer, Blissfield, Mich.; Mr. C. L. Brody, Lansing, Mich.; and Mr. N. P. Hull, Lansing, Mich.

I cannot see how this bill will be of any benefit to the dairy, fruit, vegetable, or other farmers in my district, and I can see how it might work to their great disadvantage. It is not in their interest nor in the interest of the country generally, and it should not pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, on this particular amendment, which is a repetition of the other, I take this opportunity to say that, as shown by these letters from the Department, dairy production is fully cared for in this measure. We have not only soil conservation, which, if it goes to grass, produces much less in the way of feed units than corn or other major crops, but we also have in the bill a provision whereby funds may be used for the expansion of domestic and foreign markets and for finding new markets, and the removal and disposition of surpluses. We also have another provision of the bill which has been so amended that these products can be purchased and distributed, and these letters explain fully that those things have been cared for. I ask for a vote upon the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GILCHRIST: Page 5, line 12, after the word "Secretary", strike out the word "shall" and insert the word "may."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, that is a matter about which the gentleman spoke to me the other day. I think the amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JONES for the committee: Page 6, after the period in line 15, insert: "The Secretary, in administering this section, shall in every practical way encourage and provide for soil-conserving and soil-rebuilding crops and practices rather than soil-depleting commercial crops."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment may be adopted. I was called into conference on another measure this morning and dictated this amendment in the office and asked the drafting service to take that and grind it into form. Unfortunately, I was delayed and got here only just at 12 o'clock. We had three copies of an amendment. I looked them over hurriedly. This was the basis on which I intended to tender a suggestion, one of the other side having approached me yesterday to know what I would be willing to do. I hope the House—because this is what I had honestly intended to present—will agree to this provision.

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In the first place I wish to say I agree with my colleagues from Kansas on the proposition that legislation for the relief and benefit of agriculture should not be considered as a political issue. So far as that matter is concerned, I do not believe that any legislation coming before this Congress should be discussed or considered from a purely political party standpoint. I was greatly surprised when I came here to hear the bitter partisan political speeches made from both the floor of the House and the Senate. It has always been my idea that the political party was merely the horse you rode into office on, and should be tied outside and not rode around in the legislative chambers.

Back on March 22, 1933, when the agricultural-adjustment bill was up for debate, I stated here on the floor of Congress in part that—

This is the legislation so far as the farmers are concerned, the emergency legislation that they are looking and praying for.

Mr. Speaker, the title of this bill we are considering is "A bill to relieve the existing economic emergency by increasing purchasing power"; that is what I came here to assist in doing.

And that, may I say, Mr. Chairman, in looking back over what has transpired the last 3 years, is what we did accomplish. Now we find it necessary to again pass some form of farm legislation.

Why is it necessary to pass the bill in question? The reason, of course, is due to the fact that the original Agricultural Adjustment Act was held unconstitutional by a divided Court on the 6th day of January 1936. While I do not agree with the majority opinion, yet I would not destroy the Court or undertake to curb its powers. If we should do so, Congress could then pass any conceivable law it chose, and the rights and protection of the individual citizen would be sacrificed to what would almost amount to mob law.

The majority in their opinion in holding against the constitution of the Government that the end accomplished in the act is by a voluntary cooperation makes this statement:

If the cotton grower elects not to accept the benefits, he will receive less for his crops; those who receive payments will be able to undersell him.

There must have been a misconception in regard to this point, for the reason that those who receive their payments and those who stay out would both sell their products in the market for the same price so far as any provision in the act is concerned.

The decision of the Supreme Court invalidating the Agricultural Adjustment Act is considerable of a set-back to the progress being made by the agricultural industry. However, I fear that the result of the decision is even graver than any effect it has on the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as it goes much farther and holds that the Federal Government does not have the constitutional right to in any manner whatsoever control agricultural production, and that any or all contracts so entered into by the farmers with the Government are invalid.

A constitutional amendment may be suggested to meet the situation, but the difficulty arises in that it would take some time for such an amendment to be adopted by the various States, during which time the farmers would be suffering; and then, in addition to this, I fear, with the opposition in the East, that we would have difficulty in obtaining the adoption of such an amendment by the required number of States.

It is hard to understand how the Federal Government can grant subsidies for other lines of business and give tariff benefits to them and not have the same right to grant similar benefits to the farmer. Why should not the protective-tariff laws be held unconstitutional the same as the Agricultural Adjustment Act? It is a difficult matter to try and work out at this time, and it seems that the only relief that the farmers have ever received was taken away from them.

The price of farm products may not be reduced much in the immediate future, but with the loss of our foreign markets due to competitive foreign tariffs, I fear it will be hard for us to regain the markets we once had, and if this or some similar act is not passed, within 3 or 5 years we are liable to have a large surplus of agricultural products in this country, which will consequently reduce the price of farm products to the ruinous point where they were 4 years ago.

The majority opinion also holds:

The act invades the reserved rights of the States. It is a statutory plan to regulate and control agricultural production, a matter beyond the powers delegated to the Federal Government.

And again—

But if the plan were one for purely voluntary cooperation it would stand no better so far as Federal power is concerned. At best it is a scheme for purchasing with Federal funds submission to Federal regulation of a subject reserved to the States.

While I realize that the tenth amendment to the Constitution provides that the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people, yet agriculture is not in this day and age, nor can it be, a local matter or a subject of State control. The principal markets of the farmer are generally beyond the borders of his State. The price which he receives for his products are determined at distant points and by matters almost wholly without the State in which the products are produced. Of course, it is more desirable to control production through the law of supply and demand, and that law, I believe, would in general work out if it was not interfered with, and every producer, regardless of what he produces was to be governed by the same rule; but when you change the rule for one producer, then you must change it for all. In other words, we got into our difficulty when we began to make exceptions for the benefit of the privileged few. Ultimately agriculture came to realize that it was justified in asking for the same benefits and privileges that the protected industries were receiving.

I believe that the Constitution of the United States as originally written and interpreted is—not a Constitution of special privileges or one that grants benefits to one part of the country and refuses it to another part—it is a Constitution that gives equal protection to all the States and not just a few; it is a Constitution that protects the individual citizen and not just the corporate interests; it is a Constitution that will protect the farmer under the general-welfare clause in regard to the processing tax and not the processor.

I have read and reread the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and I cannot find where the millers and processors are named as the special beneficiaries of this act, yet that is the result of the Court's interpretation. If the farmers are not entitled to the benefits of the processing tax, then why are

the millers and processors any more entitled to it, and if neither are entitled to it under the law, then why should not the people who paid it be the ones who are entitled to it, and if it cannot be returned to them, then why should not the Government have it?

The people, and the farmer in particular, while they have a great regard for the Constitution and would fight to maintain it, yet they are more interested from an economic standpoint in the results that are achieved and not in intricate legal arguments of what is constitutional or what is not constitutional. In other words, they are more interested in an excuse for doing something rather than an excuse for not doing anything. We judge any action, governmental policy, or operation by the results produced; if it does produce the results, then it is successful, if not, it is unsuccessful. I would say the most marvelous achievement of this administration that will be remembered and referred to long after the N. R. A. and all the other emergency measures are forgotten will be the successful operation performed upon the prostrate form of agriculture and the putting of the farmer back on his feet again. This achievement, I say, in view of past history, is almost unbelievable. The farmers are not asking something for nothing. The average farmer would much rather cooperate in the promotion of economic use and conservation of land and the building up of soil fertility than he would in plowing under and destroying of crops. Therefore, he will welcome any plan along these lines. On the other hand, I view this act as another emergency act to tide agriculture over, and I only regret that after January 1, 1938, there does not seem to be any clearly defined permanent plan.

No one can foretell whether this act will meet with the approval of the Supreme Court and be held constitutional. In view of the A. A. A. decision, I would say there is some question about it.

The fact that Kansas has received \$86,000,000 by the way of benefits under the A. A. A., and other agriculture States have received large benefits by reason of the A. A. A., appears to have been criticized yesterday by my good friend and colleague from Ohio, Mr. LAMNECK. Let me call the committee's attention to the fact that the gross income from farm products in the United States was reduced from close to \$12,000,000,000 a year for the average from 1924 to 1929 to \$5,240,000,000 for 1932.

That since the A. A. A. went into operation the income of the farmer has increased over \$5,000,000,000, according to a statement President Roosevelt made at Fremont, Nebr., September 28, 1935. Therefore, whatever way you look at this picture, either from the standpoint of loss or of gain, the total cost of payment to all States, as set out by our Ohio colleague on page 2369 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 19, 1936, in the amount of \$1,108,322,870.30, has been well worth the price and a worth-while investment for the country; and who will be the ultimate beneficiary of this increase in the purchasing power of the farmer? The manufacturer and the industrial East, who sell their products to the farmer, will many, many times receive back the amount of the payments they have made by way of increased profits.

All the farmer is asking is an honest price for his products, and he is willing to cooperate in any manner to achieve this end. Since the Supreme Court's decision, before mentioned, I have received many letters from farmers and resolutions from representative farm groups of my State requesting legislation along the lines suggested in this bill to take the place of the A. A. A. I would feel it my duty to support any farm legislation regardless of who introduced it or the political party affiliations of the introducer that would be beneficial to agriculture, and hence helpful to the rest of the country. With this object in mind I am voting for and supporting this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask the attention of the chairman of the committee. I do not believe the gentleman from Texas

[Mr. JONES], the chairman of the committee, gave much thought or consideration to the amendment which has just been adopted. If he had, I do not think he would have offered it at this time. I do not mean to find fault with him, because I know this has had to be done rather hurriedly and without opportunity for real consideration, but here is what the amendment provides:

The Secretary, in administering this section, shall in every practical way encourage and provide for soil-conserving and soil-rebuilding crops and practices rather than soil-depleting commercial crops.

In other words, if under the bill as we brought it out of the committee there is any possibility of the Secretary giving a square deal to dairymen, this amendment knocks out any such chance, because this amendment provides that he shall encourage and provide for the planting of soil-rebuilding crops—grasses and legumes—rather than soil-depleting commercial crops—wheat, cotton, and tobacco.

Mr. JONES. That is not what it says.

Mr. BOILEAU. Oh, it does say that.

Mr. JONES. It says they shall encourage soil-rebuilding crops.

Mr. BOILEAU. What are soil-depleting crops? Cotton, tobacco, wheat, and so forth. What are soil-conserving crops, soil-rebuilding crops that this amendment requires that he shall encourage? Grasses, legumes, alfalfa, clover. This amendment puts a greater burden upon the shoulders of the dairy industry. If the gentleman from Texas will analyze that amendment, he will come to that conclusion.

Mr. JONES. I will ask unanimous consent, if they do not want this amendment, to withdraw it.

I want to state in that connection that I place a wholly different interpretation on the amendment. My thought, which I hurriedly dictated, was that the farmer shall use soil-building, soil-conserving crops and practices rather than using soil-depleting commercial crops. Now, if the gentleman does not want it, I will withdraw it.

Mr. BOILEAU. I hope we have an understanding in the matter.

Mr. JONES. Let us withdraw it for the time being, anyway.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. I reserve the right to object for the purpose of submitting to the consideration of the earnest Members on each side of this question who, regardless of political considerations, want to arrive at a correct solution that this particular item in this bill, if it can be arranged, should be postponed or moved to the heel of the bill for consideration, if I may use that expression, in order that the maximum of opportunity may be afforded for these gentlemen to work out a satisfactory arrangement with reference to this particular part of the bill. I appreciate the fact that I am trespassing somewhat.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that I may proceed out of order for 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, the reading of the bill as such has been concluded, and there seems to be no opportunity for debate except on such occasions as may arise when one gets permission to strike out the last word or some such pro-forma amendment. I think we ought to have a little understanding at this time as to about how long the debate is going to continue and whether Members who want to express themselves on this legislation will have an opportunity to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FULLER). That is not a question for the Chair to pass upon.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] that he be allowed to speak for 3 minutes out of order?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that I am butting in on this situation and probably doing so very foolishly, but I know from the ladies and gentlemen who have spoken on this question that at least a large percent of them want to do the right thing. However, there is confusion in the minds of honest people on the floor of this House as to just what is the right thing to do in the situation. These amendments are being offered from the floor of the House, and, with all due respect to everybody concerned, they show upon their faces that they have not received the maturity of consideration which amendments dealing with such an important matter ought to have. I say that without any criticism of anybody. It is a thing that happens.

We have seen a teller vote in which this House was almost equally divided, and if there is anything in this world that we need now it is agreement on the part of the American people with regard to a complete agricultural program. There is no use disguising the fact that we recognize that a little politics will get into a question of this sort this near a Presidential election. It is bound to come, but aside from that, as I said a moment ago, it is perfectly apparent to those of us who are familiar with the personnel of this House that honest men and women who want to do exactly the same thing, arrive at the same conclusion, are in confusion at this moment. So what I would like to do, and I state it with apology, I would like to see it arranged so that this item in this bill at least could be postponed to the heel of the bill and give those members on the committee who are earnestly trying to arrive at a proper conclusion and solution of this matter the maximum of time within which to do it. Then when we get through, if we cannot do it, you will have to go to a vote and see who wins.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman propose that this portion of the bill should go over until next Monday?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Well, to the heel of the bill.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Well, we are at the heel now.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Personally, I would like to see it go over until next Monday myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] has expired.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] to withdraw the amendment which was just adopted?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. On yesterday there were amendments tentatively submitted, and the Chair has been recognizing Members who offered those amendments as nearly as possible. It will be the further object of the Chair to recognize two or three members of the committee who have amendments pending before he recognizes other Members.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN], a member of the committee, and the Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDRESEN: At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

"Sec. —. Section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, relating to reciprocal trade agreements, is hereby repealed. No agreement concluded in pursuance of such section shall have any effect after the date of the enactment of this act."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly on the point of order.

Mr. ANDRESEN. I call the Chair's attention to section 12 of the pending bill, which appears on page 7, and which deals specifically with the question before the Committee at the present time. The section reads as follows:

Whenever the Secretary finds that the exercise of the powers conferred in this section will tend to carry out the purposes specified in clause (4) of section 7 (a), he shall use such part as he deems necessary of the sums appropriated to carry out this act for the expansion of domestic and foreign markets.

My amendment, Mr. Chairman, deals with reciprocal trade agreements which have to do with the expansion of foreign and domestic markets and with the retention of the American market for the farmers of this country for that part of their product consumed in the United States. I submit, therefore, that my amendment is germane and should receive consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that this Committee has no authority to pass upon trade agreements. The amendment, therefore, is not germane.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ANDRESEN: At the end of the bill add a new section, as follows:

"Sec. —. There shall not be imported or brought into the continental United States during any period beginning on March 1 of any year and ending on the last day of February of the succeeding year any quantity of any agricultural commodity dutiable under schedule 7 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, in excess of 10 percent of the quantity thereof imported or brought into the continental United States during the calendar year 1935."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I call the Chair's attention to section 12 of the pending bill, which relates to the power conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture to use funds in connection with domestic and foreign commerce. At the present time and in connection with this particular piece of legislation the Secretary has been given the authority to expand domestic and foreign commerce.

My amendment, Mr. Chairman, proposes to limit the imports of agricultural products under schedule 7 of the tariff act so that not more than 10 percent of the quantity imported in 1935 of beef, cotton, wheat, dairy products, and other agricultural products may be imported during the next and coming years. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment is germane and within the provisions of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOPE: On page 6, after line 20, insert: "(d) No payment or grant in aid shall be made to any one producer in excess of \$2,000 during any calendar year."

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes that no payments or grants be made to an individual farmer during any one calendar year in excess of \$2,000. The amendment is designed to meet a situation which developed under the Agricultural Adjustment Act and which undoubtedly will arise under the administration of this bill when it becomes a law. I presume no Member of this House has more constituents who have drawn checks in excess of \$2,000 per year under the A. A. A. than I. There is, nevertheless, a feeling on the part of the small farmers of the country and a feeling on the part of the public that it is not proper for the Government to encourage this type of farming by the payment of benefits to a person or persons engaged in such a large-scale enterprise.

The thing we want to protect in this country is the family-sized farm, from both an economic and the social standpoint. While it may be said that the farmer who operates a 10,000-acre farm is just as much entitled to compensation for taking a part of his land and planting it in soil-building crops as the man who operates a 100-acre farm, nevertheless it is not that type of farming we desire to encourage. The farm operator who operates a 10,000-acre farm is amply able, in my opinion, to do his own soil-conservation work and to take care of the problems of soil erosion which may arise in the operation of that farm.

Furthermore, an amendment of this kind will do something to meet the situation mentioned by the gentleman

from Texas [Mr. DRES] and which has been discussed also by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], respecting the protection of small farmers and tenants. Two thousand dollars, of course, is a high limitation, but it will make more money available, it will discourage the corporation farm and the large-scale type of farming, and will assist in building up in this country the thing we want above everything else, the farm family and the family-sized farm.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that a Jersey City, N. J., farmer received a check for \$52,000 for not raising hogs?

Mr. HOPE. I was not aware of that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. An amendment has already been adopted for the benefit of the tenant farmer. The larger the farm, the more tenants there are on the farm. Would not the adoption of the gentleman's amendment tend to prevent the benefits of the bill reaching the tenant farmer?

Mr. HOPE. Not necessarily.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Why would it not? There are more tenants on a large farm than on a small farm.

Mr. HOPE. There is no reason why under this amendment the benefits cannot be paid to the tenants. None of them are going to receive more than \$2,000.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the large plantation owner is restricted, the tenants are restricted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I oppose this amendment because if it is enacted I am afraid it will tend to bring about confusion and might ultimately force the large landowners and producers of the Nation to resort to a form of subterfuge and fraud, and perhaps to even fraudulent conveyances of their property to their children or grandchildren or to their tenants, to the end that they might not be defeated in their right to receive the just benefits of this legislation.

While I am not willing to believe that any Member of this House is actuated or motivated by the impulse of selfishness or greed, I must say that as I have listened to this debate I am convinced that it is well calculated to arouse in the breasts of those who have listened at least a suspicion that selfishness and greed are, to some extent, influencing the utterances of some of the speakers. We see here a group desperately fighting for the protection of the dairy industry. In my opinion they are unduly alarmed and have greatly exaggerated and magnified what they believe are the evil potentialities of this measure. Here, on the other hand, are the consumers in the metropolitan areas attempting to protect their constituents from the possibility of an abnormal increase in commodity prices, and there is still another group which is apparently self-satisfied, which has practiced diversified farming and crop rotation in the past, and fears that it will not receive any benefits from this bill, and since it fears that it will not be benefited it is obviously unwilling to be of assistance to those in other sections of the country who have, by intensive cultivation, mined and depleted their soil.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I have a farm in my district the landlord of which has as many as 100 tenants. Would not this amendment penalize those tenants?

Mr. COOLEY. In my opinion it would.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I gladly yield to the splendid gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. There is not anything in this amendment which would prevent those tenants getting their just benefit payments.

Mr. COOLEY. I am afraid that there is. At any rate, the amendment might drive the landlords of my State to

some sort of subterfuge or fraud in order to receive the unjust benefits of this act.

In the short time I have at my disposal I want to say just a few words about the principal revenue-producing industry of this country, which has not, in the past, in my opinion, been treated fairly, except during the life of the Triple A. I refer to the tobacco farmers of my State and of the Nation.

The Supreme Court voted against the Triple A by a vote of 6 to 3; the farmers voted for the Triple A by a vote of 19 to 1, yet the Triple A is no more.

Until the Roosevelt administration came into power the tobacco farmer of this country was, in truth and in fact, the forgotten man of America.

Under the Triple A and the Kerr-Smith Tobacco Act the farmer was, for the first time in the history of tobacco growing, afforded a measure of relief. Before the days of the triple A he was heavily taxed by the Federal Government and bled to death by the tobacco trust and was at all times helpless to protect himself. The Triple A and the Kerr-Smith bill lifted him from a state of starvation, desolation, and bankruptcy to a little higher plane in our economic life, and his position was made better, not by the payment of bounties and subsidies, but by the act itself, which enabled him to control his own business and by a tax imposed upon his own industry.

The tobacco program did not cost this Government a dollar or a dime and was the most successful program undertaken by the Government. The books of the tobacco division can be balanced and will show a surplus of \$2,500,000. Out of the \$296,000,000 recently appropriated to be paid in benefits to farmers, the tobacco farmer will not receive one red copper cent.

I fear, and have good reasons to fear, that under this bill an effective program for the tobacco farmer cannot and will not be possible. We can only hope for a successful program. With the triple A invalidated and the Kerr-Smith bill repealed, the relief afforded will now entirely depend on the amount of money made available and upon voluntary cooperation.

The tobacco industry will pay into the coffers of the Federal Treasury this year approximately \$500,000,000, or an amount sufficient to pay the cost of the entire program contemplated by this bill. No one can substantiate the statement that this tremendous tax burden is not pressed back upon the brow of the tobacco farmer.

The Supreme Court in the Triple A case said that you cannot tax one class or group for the benefit of another class or group. But for years this group of tobacco farmers, for whom I speak and in whom I am particularly interested, has been all but destroyed by a tax for the benefit of all other groups. This situation cannot be justified. Tobacco is the only crop in America that pays a tax, and certainly the tobacco farmer, of all farmers in the country, has a right to call upon this Government for aid, and in granting aid to him the Government is only protecting the goose that lays the golden egg, and the greatest revenue-producing industry in the country.

Some of you may wonder why I am so deeply interested in the tobacco farmer. I come from the belt where the golden leaf is grown, and I know something of the hardships and the vicissitudes of those who labor and toil in the tobacco fields of my State, and I know that four or five men can control the livelihoods and destinies of hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children who are, at all times, at their mercy. I know that it costs money to make and to market a crop of tobacco. The crop must be grown upon a peculiar type of soil, the fertility of which we should protect. No other farmer in this world works as hard or as long as does the tobacco farmer, and none is poorer paid for his labor. He works, not 40 hours a week, but in the late summer and early fall he works more than 40 out of every 48 hours. Night and day he nurses the golden leaf from which the Government takes its heavy toll. It takes the tobacco farmer about 13 months to make and market his crop—from January until February of the following year. Surely he has a right

to say to this Government, "I must live and feed and clothe my family."

On account of the tremendous cost of cultivating, harvesting, and marketing a tobacco crop, I am somewhat afraid that a small benefit or rental payment will not induce the individual tobacco farmer to cooperate with this program and decrease the mining of his soil by intensive and extensive cultivation.

I know that the tobacco farmers have very few friends in Congress; this, of course, is due in part to the fact that tobacco is grown in very few States. But, in justice to those who are helpless, I appeal to you to vote for this bill, to the end that we may at least hope for a successful tobacco program.

Whatever the situation may be in the tobacco-growing States, I know that I can assure you that none of the Congressmen here representing districts in which tobacco is grown will permit his feelings to cause him to do or say anything that will jeopardize the enactment of this measure. Although many of us feel that the Federal Government should be generous in its efforts to aid the struggling tobacco farmers of the country, and although many of us feel that under this measure the aid granted will be meager, in comparison with the amount of assistance to which the tobacco farmer is justly entitled, I think I at least speak the sentiment of the North Carolina delegation, which does not desire to hold out a false hope to the farmers of our State, when I say that we will gladly embrace this measure, feeling that it is the best national program for the relief of agriculture which the circumstances of the present situation will permit.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOPE) there were—ayes 81, nays 130.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. JONES and Mr. HOPE to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 75, noes 127.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 5, line 15, insert: "The Secretary, in administering this section, shall in every practical way encourage and provide for soil-conserving and soil-rebuilding practices rather than the growing of soil-depleting commercial crops."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this simply corrects the language as was intended awhile ago.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZIONCHECK: Page 7, line 16, after the word "thereof", strike out the period and insert "Provided, That no export subsidy shall be paid with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof unless the Secretary finds that it is not feasible, or practicable, to expand the domestic consumption of such commodity or product by diversion from the normal or regular channels of the domestic trade, including purchases for donations to the F. S. C. C."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve all points of order against the amendment.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which, to my mind, is a most important one. I think it is a good amendment. Although you may read this bill carefully and cautiously, it would probably take most of us about a week to ascertain that this bill provides for dumping and provides a subsidy for dumping American products to Europe, Africa, and China.

In other words, take butter as an illustration. If the Secretary of Agriculture says that butter is worth 25 cents and the butter buyers will not take it, the Secretary of Agri-

culture, as I understand it, can buy butter and proceed to export it or give subsidies to those who do export to foreign countries; and if they only get 7 cents in such foreign country, then the general taxpayers of this country will have to pay 18 cents for every pound of butter exported.

This amendment provides that if we are going to do any dumping we shall dump to the underprivileged at home before we dump to the foreigners abroad. In other words, there are many people who would like to have more bread and could use it. There are many people who would like to have more butter, and they could use it. Why not give them the butter at 7 cents or give it to them for nothing if they really need it before we give it to foreigners and then, in turn, have these foreigners send the same butter back to us and pay the duty and make money on it? This is suicidal. In other words, I maintain that if you want to dump, dump at home, where we have, as they say, a table of plenty, and at least help everyone here with a first helping before we start in giving second helpings to people abroad.

The chairman of the committee says the amendment is not germane. Well, I can tell the chairman of the committee that some people whom I cannot name, with legal minds, in the Department of Agriculture, prepared the amendment and said it should be put in at this place; and I should like to have the chairman of the committee get up here and say that the Secretary of Agriculture is opposed to this amendment. I do not say he is for it, but let the gentleman say that he is opposed to it.

This is not a partisan amendment. I have a letter here from Floyd Oles, who was a campaign manager for my predecessor here in Congress. I ask unanimous consent to read two paragraphs of the letter and then I shall ask unanimous consent to put the entire letter in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

L. P. C. CONTROL COMMITTEE,  
Seattle, Wash., February 14, 1936.

HON. MARION A. ZIONCHECK,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the course of the consideration of any revision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, there will probably come up the question of the retention or amendment of section 32 of the current act, which provides for the use of 30 percent of the customs receipts for the distribution of surplus commodities or their diversion to various channels. On behalf of some thirteen or fourteen hundred farmers who are associated with this organization in western Washington, I wish to speak a word in behalf of the retention of section 32 or its essential parts.

In the last two marketing seasons we have had the benefit of a very small appropriation of money to divert surpluses of vegetables to relief uses. Not only has this money been properly and effectively used in such a manner as to give the relief organization a very large and satisfactory return in products for the money expended, but this small expenditure has been responsible for maintaining a market for vegetables in this territory during what would otherwise have been definitely disastrous seasons. We are hopeful that the same modest appropriation may again be available during the coming season.

The method of application has been simple. A sum was set aside to purchase all surpluses from time to time and divert them to uses other than the regular channels of trade. Small quantities indeed were all that were purchased, but the effect upon the market was instant and salutary. This small expenditure set the pace for all other purchases for other than the normal market uses and had the effect of assuring a return to farmers of a sum scores of times as large as the amount expended in the effort.

I sincerely hope that your influence will be exerted toward retaining the essential provisions of section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Very sincerely yours,

L. P. C. CONTROL COMMITTEE,  
FLOYD OLES, Managing Agent.

Mr. Chairman, unless something is done in this bill for American consumers, it is nothing but a program of destruction and curtailment of production, because I realize that even with my amendment and other amendments presented pertaining to consumers, that this is not a cure for the depression; that we must produce everything it is possible to produce, and then distribute it among the American consumers. Any program of taking from Paul and giving to John is false in its premise, and does no more than assist in keeping an antiquated system alive, a system where we curtail production, ship so-called surpluses to foreign countries for foreign consumption, when millions of Americans are underfed.

Let us not continue in this crazy manner, but work out ways and means for a land of abundance, where every man, woman, and child may have all of the things that this great Nation is able to produce.

Unless this amendment or others embodying the same principles are accepted to this bill, I will not and cannot vote for it in fairness to the people I represent.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and put the entire letter in the RECORD.

THE CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late and, realizing the urgent necessity of passing this bill before we adjourn for the day, I shall speak very briefly with reference thereto.

The district which I represent is one of the richest agricultural sections of the United States and my people are vitally interested in legislation designed to conserve and properly utilize the soil resources of the Nation and to aid the farmers in its cultivation.

Crop planting is at hand in Texas and if we are to have any legislation in time for this year's crop it must be passed at once.

I am glad that we are to substitute the House bill, H. R. 10835, for the Senate bill. While the bills are largely alike the House Committee on Agriculture, of which my colleague from Texas, Mr. JONES, is chairman, has, in my judgment, improved upon several features of the Senate bill, and we have still further improved the bill by adopting the amendment by my colleague from Texas, Mr. DRES, which is in this language:

In carrying out the provisions of the bill the Secretary shall in every practical manner protect the interest of small producers.

I also voted for the amendment by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], which I am glad was adopted, which reads as follows:

On page 5, line 22, after the word "producers", insert a comma and the following: "including tenants and croppers"; on page 6, line 8, after the word "made", insert a comma and the following: "and in determining the apportionment of any payment or grant with respect to any land, the Secretary shall take into consideration the contribution in services of tenants and croppers, and any loss of income sustained by tenants and croppers by reason of changes in the farming practices adopted during such years."

The interests of the small producers and also that of the tenants and croppers must be protected in any legislation that we pass. Under the Agriculture Adjustment Act and also the Bankhead law, both of which have now been repealed, there was some criticism that in their administration in some instances the small farmers and the tenants did not receive the benefits to which they were entitled. I sincerely hope that the Secretary of Agriculture will see to it that under this new law the small farmers and the tenants are given fair and equitable treatment. That is the will of this House as expressed in the two amendments which we have adopted, and it is his duty to see that they are carried into effect.

Under the decision of the Supreme Court holding unconstitutional the Triple A Act the power of Congress to legislate is greatly circumscribed, and the Committee on Agriculture and those who drafted this law have not been able to draft the kind of legislation they would have preferred, and this bill is not my choice as to dealing with the subject. It gives blanket authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to make Federal payments to farmers for land conservation. There will be no tags or tax such as we had under the Bankhead law, and there will be no contracts such as was had under the Triple A. Everything will be voluntary on the part of the farmer.

The payment by the Secretary of Agriculture direct to producers is only authorized for 2 years—that is, during the crop years of 1936 and 1937—after that time payments will be made in the nature of State aid; that is, the various

States will set up agencies and the Federal Government will contribute to the States and the States will deal with the individual farmers.

This bill may not work; if so, we can repeal it at the next session of Congress. It is designed to and I believe will materially contribute to the conservation of the soil and aid the farmers of America in maintaining and holding the degree of recovery which they have already made from the depression. It is unthinkable that agriculture and the farmers of America shall revert to the condition they were in when Franklin D. Roosevelt became President on March 4, 1933. Critics may talk about platform pledges and performances of the administration, but not one of the sharpshooters seeking to discredit and destroy the President can claim that he has not made good in his pledge to aid agriculture. He stated at the outset that the restoration of the buying power of the farmers of America was essential to recovery, and I am glad that today some of the Members from the industrial sections have spoken in support of this bill and have admitted that which we all know, that the industrial sections have begun to recover because the farmers' income has been substantially increased.

The prices of all major agricultural products have doubled under the Roosevelt administration. According to the Alexander Hamilton Institute, New York statistical organization, the total farm cash income in 1935 amounted to \$6,932,000,000 as compared with \$4,328,000,000 in 1932. Farm income in 1935 was 60.2 percent higher than for the low of the depression.

According to the figures of this institute the prices which farmers paid for goods they bought in 1935 were only 1.4 percent higher than in 1934. Consequently the farmers' purchasing power for 1935 increased nearly as much as their income for that year over 1934. The farmers' purchasing power in 1935 was 7 percent higher than in 1934. As compared with the low of the depression the farmers' purchasing power in 1935 showed a smaller increase than their income due to a 16.6 percent rise in price level of the goods they bought. While their income was 60.2 percent higher than in 1932, their purchasing power was only 33.8 higher. At the same time the purchasing power of the farmers made a more favorable comparison with 1929 than their income, since the prices which they paid were 18.5 percent below the predepression level. While their income was 33.8 percent lower than in 1929, their purchasing power showed a decrease of only 18.8 percent. The farmers' purchasing power in 1935 therefore represented the recovery of 54 percent of the ground lost in the 1929-32 slump.

We are rapidly emerging from the depression, but we must hold the gains we have made; and it is my opinion that if we do not pass this or some similar bill there will be an immediate slump in the prices of all major agricultural products. I shall therefore support it and urge its immediate passage.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against this bill. I say that reluctantly. The amendment that would have protected dairy farmers of my State was defeated. I must protect New York City's milk supply. But aside from that, I believe the principle of the bill is wrong.

Our prosperity depends upon our exportable surplus. The bill would prevent abundance. It would destroy exportable surpluses. As was clearly pointed out in an editorial in the Brooklyn Daily Eagle recently, each farm proposal, including the Jones bill, is "based upon the theory that farmers must be paid a subsidy to offset the costs to them of the excessive tariffs. The effect of such legislation is bound to be a further entrenchment of the tariff rates that have already played havoc with farmers and the country, and the creation of another vested interest similar to the groups now benefiting from monopolistic tariff schedules."

Restore our export markets and the farm problem is solved. To do this we must embark upon the plan of breaking down high tariff barriers. Europe will not buy our agricultural products and thus relieve our farmers, unless we buy from Europe. It is quid pro quo. I do not advocate free trade, simply general reasonable lowering of tariffs. Roosevelt and Hull are doing excellent work in the reciprocity trade

treaties. Those treaties are not establishing free trade. They are predicated upon protection, but limited protection and not protection that fosters manufacturing monopolies. I want to let into this country by a bill lowering our tariffs and by the reciprocity procedure enough diversified imports of foreign manufactures to pay for vast quantities of our agricultural products. During the years 1924 to 1929 we had great and lucrative export trading, but those exports were paid for by moneys we loaned Europe. We cannot loan again in that fashion. We cannot again furnish money to Europe to pay for the goods and products supplied by our farmers.

We must follow one of two courses: Either, first, export farm products and not interfere with farm production either by process taxes or soil-erosion schemes and pay for those farm products by allowing Europe to export into this country its manufactured products through lower tariffs; or, second, keep the tariff as high as it is, freeze out imports, and curtail farm production.

Curtail farm production and you are bound to increase prices of farm products. We in the city pay the increased cost. Curtail production and you curtail trade and business resulting in less employment and greater relief rolls.

It is about time we awakened to the idea that a high protective tariff—which plagues at the present time—does not give us prosperity with high wages and increased employment. High tariff did not prevent our depression. It has been accompanied since 1929 by low wages, little employment, and dreadful distress.

This bill, with its soil-erosion idea, will do no good. It must be followed by a bill to raise the money. Where is it going to come from? We are taxed to the hilt.

Let us, therefore, let the farmer produce under ordinary competitive conditions and under no unusual, artificial Government restraints or inducements. Pull down our tariffs so that the farmer may export abroad.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane as a substitute for my amendment.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I am not offering it as a substitute, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JONES. I thought I had an amendment pending.

The CHAIRMAN. No; the amendment of the gentleman from Texas was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the committee amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the committee substitute which I offered and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WITHROW. Is it the intention of the Chair that men who have pro-forma amendments shall be given preference in recognition over those who have bona-fide amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not; and that practice has not prevailed here today. I have recognized more Members on the gentleman's side, by 2 to 1, than I have on the Democratic side, although there are twice as many Members on that side. The Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I have offered an amendment and made an argument upon it, and these gentlemen are bringing about confusion here before I have a vote on the amendment. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ZIONCHECK]. The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 7, after the word "Hawaii", strike out "and the possession of Puerto Rico"; page 8, line 9, after the word "Hawaii", strike out "and Puerto Rico."

**Mr. KENNEY.** Mr. Chairman, this bill is designed to benefit the farmers of 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. We all realize that this will help the farmers of many States of the United States, but the bill will not be of any great benefit in point of dollars and cents to my State of New Jersey.

If we look to the benefits accruing from the A. A. A., the figures show that under the Triple A the farmers of New Jersey received \$520,000 in benefit payments, while the State contributed more than \$4,000,000 in processing taxes. Besides that, New Jersey has contributed something like \$60,000,000 in miscellaneous Federal taxes and more than \$50,000,000 in income taxes.

I do not feel that I can vote to put my people into bankruptcy, and I do not know how benefit payments under this bill are to be raised. The bill calls for an expenditure in benefits, according to estimate, of \$600,000,000. New Jersey will have to contribute heavily under any tax plan. The State's relief funds are exhausted. Our consumers will pay high prices for necessities under the bill. New Jersey will be called upon to pay a large part of the proposed benefits. It is well for us to be generous, but charity begins at home.

If we are to give Puerto Rico the advantages accruing under this bill, we ought to extend to Alaska, Hawaii, and the States the rights and privileges the United States Government has granted Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico has privileges not accorded to the people of the United States, which puts her in a superior position to meet the exigencies of the times.

Under Triple A something like \$3,888,000 went to Puerto Rico for benefits and rentals. The island contributed in processing taxes only one million and a half dollars. So that, over and above her contribution, she received over \$2,300,000. Only the other day we provided for a 5-year P. W. A. plan involving an expenditure there of \$10,000,000 during the next 5 years. Then the United States Government permits in Puerto Rico a voluntary tax in which all may join by participation for a small amount in extraordinary drawings, two of which in about a year have furnished a sum between \$300,000 and \$500,000 for relief purposes and the care of its hospitals.

We seem to be discriminating in favor of Puerto Rico. Why should we be denied the same opportunity given to Puerto Rico of raising money for expenses through voluntary contributions of our citizens? If you vote down this amendment and give Puerto Rico the farm benefits called for by this bill, then you ought to let us raise the money to pay off the obligations we are incurring on the same basis that we permit Puerto Rico to do so. You gentlemen of the farming sections should be interested not to cripple our taxpayers, and you can relieve them at the same time that you are receiving benefits under this bill if you will sign the petition on the Speaker's desk to discharge the Ways and Means Committee from further consideration of H. R. 8540. By such action on your part the money will be available for our purposes without any new tax bill. The taxpayer wants to be fair to the farmer. We should be fair to the taxpayer.

**Mr. CROWTHER.** Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I can add anything to the wisdom contributed in the discussion of this bill. I was interested in the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], who suggested that, of course, a little politics might creep into a measure of this character. As a matter of fact, the politics are already in. This is essentially an administration measure and, of course, the bill is going to pass. My Democratic friends in the House know that if they were to desert the farm program and leave it where the Supreme Court decision left it and say, "We did the best we could for you, but the Court decided against it", they could not carry a single State west of the central line of Ohio. They know that and, of course, we know it, too. This bill is just the A. A. A. in disguise. They have got it dressed up in blue glasses and Santa Claus whiskers and a tin cup that \$500,000,000 will be poured into. That is all there is to this bill. We know it is slated for passage.

Last summer I traveled in the West as far as Colorado and Nebraska through Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, and

Kansas, and everybody I contacted on the farms was for this type of legislation. It is a system that you cannot beat politically. You have selected the most successful method in the world of attempting to reelect yourselves next time. [Applause on the Democratic side.] When you give the average farmer an opportunity to walk down to his mail box or ride down in his car a couple of weeks before election day or a couple of weeks before Christmas and pick up one of these nice long envelopes with a green United States Treasury check in it, you have established a very practical method of securing votes for your party in the coming election. That is the real reason this bill is going to pass. You do not dare stop that program. You realize that it is most efficient. I am not against the farmer's receiving a just return for his products and placing him on an even keel with industry, but I do not think this is the right method. I would be willing to let you take all of the money from the tariff revenue and pay a subsidy to the farmer, if necessary; but this is not the right way to do it. You are doing it under false pretenses.

Under the guise of soil conservation, and so forth, you are presenting another crop-control measure—which, by the way, is decidedly unfair to the dairy farmers of the country.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment was rejected.

**Mr. WITHROW.** Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 8, in lines 8 and 9 strike out the words "is likewise authorized to be made available until June 30, 1936", and insert in lieu thereof the words "shall remain available for the purposes enumerated in said acts until June 30, 1937."

**Mr. JONES.** Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the amendment.

**Mr. WITHROW.** Mr. Chairman, I realize that if the distinguished gentleman from Texas insists upon his point of order the Chairman will be compelled to rule my amendment out of order, but I sincerely hope he will not insist upon the point of order. In 1934 we passed what was known as the Jones-Connally Cattle Act. As amended by the Senate, that measure provided for a possible authorization of \$250,000,000. However, the Appropriations Committee, after due consideration, saw fit to appropriate only \$150,000,000. The actual appropriations were made in 1934. In 1935 this House continued the unexpended balances until June 30, 1936. The House did this by waiving all points of order upon the measure, which made it unnecessary for the Appropriations Committee to again pass upon the propriety and the amount of the appropriation.

My amendment will do just exactly what was done a year ago, in that it will make it unnecessary for the Appropriations Committee to reappropriate these unexpended balances.

There are a great many of us from dairy States who are fearful of the effects of the passage of this legislation. While I am of the opinion that normally we have no dairy surpluses, I must admit that at the present time, due to a bad case of underconsumption, we do have dairy surpluses. There is every indication that during the next fiscal year these dairy surpluses will reach their peak. Therefore we feel that the adoption of this amendment provides a safety valve for our surpluses and the proper usage of the unexpended balances will prevent the bottom falling out of the price producers receive for dairy products.

In every State in which the production-control program of the A. A. A. has been in effect there has been a material and astonishing increase in the production of butterfat, and likewise a material increase in the number of milk cows, which means an increase in dairy surpluses. I sincerely hope the chairman will not insist upon his point of order.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

**Mr. JONES.** Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: Page 6, line 8, after the word "year", change the period into a semicolon, at the end of the amendment by Judge TARVER, just adopted, and add immediately thereafter the following words: "and also the curtailment of the market and depression of the prices for the products of the land not directly affected by the program set forth in this act, by the use of the land directly affected or by its products."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, the hay farmers of the United States may be ruined by the operation of this act. Every acre of land taken out of cultivation is very apt to be put into grass which, whether offered for sale or not, will be fed, and thereby every ton of it that is raised will decrease the vanishing market of the hay farmers of America.

Marion Junction, Ala., used to ship 1,500 carloads of hay every year. Last year there were shipped from that place only 100 carloads. The reason for this is clear to every thoughtful person who is familiar with the operation of the Bankhead Cotton Control Act and the A. A. A. The row-crop farmers of Alabama, before the acreage-reduction program, used to buy a large part of the hay grown by the hay farmers of Alabama. But since then the acres taken out of production of row crops have produced a sufficiency of hay to feed the work animals of the row-crop farmers of Alabama, and therefore that part of the market for the hay produced by the hay farmers of Alabama has gone.

The pending bill—which I favor and shall vote for—will take out of row-crop production an exceedingly large acreage, 90 percent of which will be planted to or produce grasses. This will mean the same curtailment of the market of the hay farmers and continue to keep the price of hay depressed.

This amendment is designed to relieve this distressing situation, which is sure to arise. I earnestly urge the passage of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HULL: On page 7, line 16, after the word "thereof", insert the following: "In carrying out the provisions of this section the Secretary is authorized and empowered to enter into contracts with associations of producers or associations composed of producer associations as defined by the act of Congress of February 18, 1922, as amended, known as the Capper-Volstead Act, under which said associations may be designated by the Secretary as the agency to carry out any program authorized by this section, and the Secretary is further authorized and empowered to allot to said associations whatever funds may be necessary to carry out any program authorized by this section."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman kindly reserve the point of order?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in this bill of benefit to northern dairymen. There is much in this bill that may be and will be, in my opinion, very detrimental to their industry. There is nothing in the whole measure that gives the dairymen a look-in anywhere in this entire program. The amendment which I have offered is offered on the part of the cooperative dairy associations which handle a large part of the butter and cheese production of my State and the adjoining States. It is to permit the dairy cooperatives to come in just the same as other agencies may come in under the bill, as is provided on page 6, and have a share in its administration. In other words, to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to use these associations for the purpose of carrying out the objects and general aims of the act. That is what this amendment means. It was adopted in the other body as a part of their bill without a single vote in opposition. When we substituted the House bill for the Sen-

ate bill, automatically this amendment died. I am offering it for the purpose of putting it back into the bill, in order that that same provision may be in our bill as it was in the bill of the Senate.

Mr. CLAIBORNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I yield.

Mr. CLAIBORNE. Why do you not confine it to the dairy industry, then?

Mr. HULL. I am willing that some other Member offer an amendment if he desires to do so. I am making it broad enough so that it cannot be ruled out on a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] has expired.

Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes, sir. This has to do with the market stabilization and prices of commodities, while this section does not deal with that at all. It is not germane to it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; I do, Mr. Chairman. That is the reason I made it.

Mr. HULL. I desire to be heard on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HULL. Permit me to call attention to lines 8 to 15 on page 6 of this bill:

In carrying out the provisions of this section the Secretary is authorized to utilize county and community committees of agricultural producers and the agricultural extension service, or other approved State and local agencies.

It provides already that the Secretary may have the assistance of such organizations in the administration of the measure. This amendment includes among them these dairy producer associations and associations of such organizations.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FULLER). The Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HULL) there were ayes 46 and noes 115.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MONAGHAN. I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONAGHAN: Page 9, line 9, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 4. Federal judges are forbidden to declare this act of Congress unconstitutional.

"No appeal shall be permitted in any case in which the constitutionality of this act is challenged, the passage by Congress of this act being deemed conclusive presumption of its constitutionality.

"Any Federal judge who declares this act unconstitutional is hereby declared to be guilty of violating the constitutional requirements of 'good behavior'."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this has gone far enough to make it clear that it is subject to a point of order. I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not need any enlightenment on this amendment.

Mr. MONAGHAN. I want to be heard on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will confine it to the point of order and make it brief, the Chair will hear him.

Mr. MONAGHAN. I have presented this amendment because I believe that the Supreme Court does not have a monopoly on knowledge of the Constitution or law. I wish to say that every bill brought before this Congress has a saving or separability clause in it. I have offered this in lieu of the separability clause, which the Supreme Court will please take notice is absent from both this bill and the Senate bill. I offer it under the authority of article III, section 2, of the Constitution, which gives the Congress the power to except legislation from the jurisdiction of the Court.

I supported this bill and hope that this amendment to except it from the Court's jurisdiction will prevail, not be-

cause I believe that the bill is the last and final word for relief of the farmer but because it embodies some small portion of the relief which that great part of society, so indispensable to our livelihood, needs. I had hoped that I might be able to present such an amendment to the Frazier-Lemke bill, which I hoped would be brought before the House long before this for passage to save the farms of those millions who are now in distress. The widespread demand for the Frazier-Lemke bill proves the need of aid for the farmer.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FULLER). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair holds that it goes further than separability. It includes judicial procedure, and is therefore not germane. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREEN: On page 7, line 4, after the word "commodity", insert a comma and the following: "including gum turpentine and gum rosin."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was drawn after conference with Members of the other legislative branch and Members of Congress, because we felt that possibly these producers of gum turpentine and gum rosin should be specifically provided for. I hope the Committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, if we go to naming commodities, there is no place to stop. I am sorry, but the committee cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. GREEN. I have obtained assurance from official sources that gum turpentine and gum rosin are included in the scope of the bill as same as other agricultural products. Consequently, if the chairman will not accept the amendment, I ask consent to withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOILEAU: On page 8, line 23, after the word "out", insert "section 2 and"; page 9, line 2, after the word "appropriated", insert "or reappropriated"; and on page 9, line 7, strike out all after the period down through line 9 and insert "The authorization which is limited to June 30, 1936, contained in section 37 of Public Act No. 320 (74th Cong.), is likewise extended so that the funds therein authorized are authorized to be made available until June 30, 1937."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I have sought this time for the purpose, first, of thanking the committee for accepting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] this morning appropriating \$2,000,000 for the immediate execution of an emergency wind-erosion program in the Dust Bowl of the drought area in the Southwest. This condition is a menace not only to that country but it is a menace to much of the agricultural area of the Great Plains country, which can be saved only by the strong hand of the Federal Government, if it can be saved.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard much about the forgotten man. I want to say something about the forgotten land, the land which seemingly God has forgotten. I get letters from it every day, letters which make my heart ache and which I am hardly able to answer. I refer to the land which has come to be known as the Dust Bowl, where for 4 successive years there has been a drouth, growing in intensity until in the past 2 years there has been an almost total crop loss, and threatened with a fifth year, a land in which a population of farmers, practically 100 percent American, are carrying on a fight against a pitiless nature without parallel in the history of this country.

In the last 2 years the dust storms have originated, black blizzards, reaching to such a height that airplanes must fly at an altitude of 15,000 feet to surmount them, turning day into night, and once beautiful fields into deserts, and spreading a pall of dust at times which has drifted over the National Capital, obscuring the sun and reaching far out into the Atlantic Ocean.

It is more than a local problem. The circle is expanding. The soil from the blown lands is carried many miles, destroying crops and damaging lands which have not blown. Millions of acres have been ruined and other millions will be, unless preventive measures can be put to work.

Such a program must be long-time. The appropriation of \$2,000,000 is for a superficial and temporary treatment only, a listing program which should have been under way weeks ago, a program which should be completed by the time it will only be started.

A five-state conference was held in my home city, Pueblo, Colo., on December 5 last, which approved an emergency wind-erosion program. The areas represented were southwestern Colorado, southwestern Kansas, western Oklahoma, northwestern Texas, and eastern New Mexico. Several Department representatives from Washington attended, also the directors and representatives of these departments in the affected States. It was felt that the actual work on the ground should be begun by January 15. It is now nearly March 1 and we are only getting to the appropriation of funds. This, however, is no fault of the Resettlement Administration. Funds appropriated for other purposes could not be transferred and only this act of Congress can furnish the necessary funds.

What this delay has resulted in is shown by the following telegram received by me from the board of county commissioners of Baca County, in my district:

SPRINGFIELD, COLO., February 19, 1936.

HON. JOHN A. MARTIN, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.:

Ten mass meetings were held Monday in this county on listing program. Dust storms are occurring almost daily. We request advice on progress of bill providing for listing program and how soon emergency listing can be started. We urge that funds be made available immediately for emergency work. If we do not have assistance immediately all wheat in the county will be lost and much land destroyed, with conditions rapidly becoming worse with thawing weather. Every person, organization, and municipality in the county is behind this.

THE COUNTY COMMITTEE AND THE BOARD OF  
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, BACA COUNTY.

I am told that many thousand acres of wheat have already been destroyed, not only in southeastern Colorado but in the other areas named. A businessman just arriving from Amarillo, Tex., says that 3 weeks ago they had a splendid prospect for wheat—now it is a desert. He said eastbound airplanes from Albuquerque, N. Mex., detoured hundreds of miles through Dallas to reach Amarillo, and flew at an altitude of 15,000 feet over the surface of an ocean of dust.

Mr. Chairman, there is only one way by which this great and growing menace can be combated and conquered and that is through soil conservation. Much of this land must be renatured, that is, taken out of cultivation and returned to grass for regulated grazing. Other of it can be preserved and built up by the contour system, a light, trenching system following the contours of the land so as to catch and conserve rainfall, which is now being demonstrated by the soil-conservation service in the drought area. This, I say, must be a long-time program. And it must take in much more territory than the so-called Dust Bowl or the still larger drought area.

Mr. Chairman, as I have driven about over the western country with my eyes opened by what I have learned in the past few years about soil erosion, water as well as wind erosion, the devastation being wrought by deforestation, overgrazing, scratch farming, water, and wind, I have become alarmed for the future of the country. I have seen the 15-foot soil bed of a mountain valley washed down to the gravel. In my lifetime I have seen streams widened from 40 or 50 feet to 600 or 800 feet. I have seen the growth of the arroyos eating into and destroying the lands along the streams. I have seen once grassy stretches turned into sand boils which would make a man's flesh creep.

This destruction has been largely man-made, and it must be cured in the same way. In going about over my district last fall it occurred to me that it would take the combined and continued activities of all the Federal agencies now at work to stop this progressive destruction. Much of it is irremediable, but the process is continuing.

No bigger problem confronts this country than soil conservation. For that reason alone I would support the pending bill, and for that reason alone it is entitled to the support of every Member of this House. This country could well afford to spend \$500,000,000 this year and every succeeding year to stop the waste and destruction which is depleting the greatest and the most permanent source of natural wealth—the soil.

#### THE NEW FARM BILL

Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words about the farm bill. I am supporting this bill, but not on the theory that it will replace the A. A. A. I want to refer to the opening sentence of an editorial from the leading antiadministration paper in the Rocky Mountain country. It is as follows:

Senator ———, of ———, says the administration substitute farm bill is worse than the A. A. A. He is dead right about that.

I want to agree with the Senator and the editorial writer but for a different reason. It is worse than the A. A. A., because it is not as good. No substitute is as good. The McNary-Haugen plan is not as good. No tariff equalization is as good. No bonus or substitute is as good. Under the A. A. A., each farm commodity stood on its own bottom, financed its own plan. It was a simple plan. The effect of the processing tax on the producer, the processor, and the consumer could be easily calculated. The plan was working. It had been accepted by nine-tenths of the farmers and most of the processors. The former were getting a better share of the profits of the latter. This is the reason an unjust burden was not falling on the consumer. After all, the producer comes first. He must produce before anybody can consume. Also the farmer himself to the extent of one-fourth of our population is a consumer. As pointed out by the farmers of Kansas in resolutions read by me in some remarks I made a few days ago, neither the farmers nor the consumers were protesting and filing suits in the courts—only the processors, who were only the collectors of the tax and who were getting by. The processor always gets by.

Mr. Chairman, the case for A. A. A. can never be better stated than by the American Farm Bureau Federation at Chicago only last December, when they declared that the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and its amendments of 1935 were the successful culmination of a 12-year fight made by organized agriculture in the United States, that 2½ years of administration had proved the soundness of its principles, and dedicating themselves to its continued support and improvement.

#### WHAT THIS BILL PROVES

Mr. Chairman, there are honest conflicting views about the pending farm bill. There are able, honest, well-informed men contending for other plans. But this bill and the debates on the bill in both Houses demonstrate one thing beyond argument, and that is that agriculture in the United States must have the aid of Government. Not 10 percent of the membership of either House oppose this bill on the ground that agriculture needs no such aid. They oppose it on the ground that it is not a good plan or that some other plan is better. They are practically agreed on the proposition that some plan is needed.

It is a disturbing thing that agriculture, the great basic industry of the Nation, is not self-supporting. The class which produces all the food of all the people cannot make a living out of it and must get in one form or another a Government subsidy.

Here is another fact, even more disturbing. If some part of the present plight of agriculture can be attributed to the depression, the fact remains that during the period from 1921 to 1929, conceded to be the most prosperous period in the history of this, or any other nation, agriculture became bankrupt. The crash of October 1929 did not bring agriculture low; it was already prostrate. During several years of that period every industry but agriculture, every business but agriculture, every line of enterprise but agriculture, was making money. Agriculture was going bankrupt, not only agriculture in some lines, but agriculture in all lines. If wheat and cotton and corn and hogs and cattle were worth nothing, chickens and eggs and milk and butter were worth nothing. The only thing that flourished and prospered in

connection with agriculture was mortgages, interest, and taxes.

This is an almost unbelievable phenomenon. It indicates some basic trouble in the national economy. We cannot hope to get back to where the people will consume more, or much more, than they consumed from 1921 to 1929. We cannot hope for a major solution in increased domestic consumption. Nor do I believe we can look for it through a major increase in exports. Perhaps no one cause is responsible for this phenomenon. Perhaps one man's guess is as good as another. My guess is, uncontrolled and unregulated production and marketing. What industry in this country could keep off the rocks in the unregulated and uncontrolled way in which agriculture is conducted? Not any. When supply begins to overrun demand, when a glut is in sight, Ford and General Motors shut down, the industrial plants and the mines suspend, but the farmer and the dairyman keep right on. This, as I see it, while not the whole problem, is a sufficiently large part of it to challenge the best thought of the leaders of the Nation in government, in agriculture, and in industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURDICK: After the last word in the bill, insert the following new section:

#### "BOARD OF APPEALS, APPOINTMENT, POWERS, AND DUTIES

"For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act there is hereby created a Board of Appeals to consist of three members, to be appointed by the President of the United States. One member shall represent agriculture, one shall represent the consuming public.

#### "COMPLAINTS

"Any farmer, or group of farmers, dissatisfied with any ruling or order of the Secretary of Agriculture made, promulgated, or decided by said Secretary, may take an appeal therefrom to the said Board of Appeals, and the final decision of said Board of Appeals shall be final so far as the rights of a farmer or group of farmers are concerned under the provisions of this bill.

#### "COMPENSATION AND DUTIES OF SAID BOARD OF APPEALS

"The members of said Board of Appeals shall be paid the sum of \$5,000 per annum and their necessary traveling expenses to and from the place or places of hearings had in connection with complaints arising under the terms of this act. Their principal office and place of business shall be in the city of Washington, but they are hereby authorized to hold hearings on complaints anywhere in the United States, upon notice given complainants, in writing, duly deposited in the United States Post Office directed to the complainant or complainants at their place of residence at least 15 days prior to such hearing."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Dakota desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. BURDICK. You have done everything else in this bill; you have conferred absolute autocratic power upon the Secretary of Agriculture. Merely because I want to release you from this arbitrary power and leave a modicum of freedom to the American farmers, the gentleman says it is not in order. Is this the gentleman's position?

Mr. JONES. I say merely that in several places the language of the amendment does not follow the rule of germaneness.

Mr. BURDICK. I simply set up a Federal board to which a farmer, if he is not satisfied with an order of the Secretary of Agriculture, can appeal and not have to suffer the consequences of being before a czar.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that the amendment is not germane and sustains the point of order.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Hobbs: Between lines 2 and 3, on page 7, insert:

"Sec. 9½. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to make loans to any farmers whose lands are not in any soil-conservation demonstration area and which are in need of

terracing and should be terraced, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, to each of such farmers the amount of money necessary to have his land terraced by some approved terracing association, the repayment of each of such loans to be secured in any way which in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture shall give reasonable assurance of repayment; such loans may be made for such length of time as may be agreed upon, not exceeding 5 years, and shall bear interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum, the interest and such part of the principal as shall amortize and repay the loan in equal annual installments to be payable annually: *Provided, however,* That no loan shall exceed \$3 per acre nor a total of \$2,000.

"For carrying out the purpose of this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such an amount of money as may be necessary to achieve the manifest intent."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my point of order.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, the sole purpose of this amendment is to equalize opportunity for soil conservation and up-building among all of the people of our Nation instead of the chosen few who have the money to pay for the terracing of their lands.

I make the statement without fear of successful contradiction that 98 percent of all terracing in this country outside of the demonstration areas now connected with soil-conservation projects, is upon the lands of the rich. I am no baiter of the rich, but I do submit that if we mean business in the matter of soil conservation we must make it available to those who have small and run-down farms, as well as to those who can afford to pay for it presently.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I yield.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman anticipate that only the rich will be benefited by the soil-conservation act which will be passed here today?

Mr. HOBBS. No; this is a good bill and will benefit both rich and poor; but I want the benefits to be derived from terracing to be made available to all.

Mr. Chairman, I am 110 percent for the bill under consideration, but I insist that this amendment will make it a better bill, and should be adopted.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order and rules that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in connection with my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to correct, if necessary, the section numbers and cross-references.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include in the extension of my remarks a short paragraph from report of a committee of the National Cooperative Council.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered as a substitute for the Senate bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FULLER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 3780) to produce the conservation and profitable use of agricultural land resources by temporary Federal aid to

farmers, and by providing for a permanent policy of Federal aid to States for such purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 419, reported the same back to the House with an amendment agreed to in Committee.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOILEAU moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. JONES, containing the provisions of H. R. 10835: On page 6, line 20, strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "and any payment or grant or other aid which is conditioned in whole or in part upon the growth of soil-restoration, soil-conservation, or erosion-preventing crops on any land, or any change in the kind of crop to be grown on any land, shall be subject to the further condition that no crops intended for sale be harvested from, and no livestock intended for sale, or the products of which are intended for sale, be grazed or pastured on such land."

"(d) No payment shall be made to any producer exceeding \$2,000 in any calendar year."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, on the motion to recommit I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 146, nays 225, answered "present" 1, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—146

Allen	Dunn, Pa.	Kniffin	Risk
Amle	Ekwall	Knutson	Robston, Ky.
Andresen	Engel	Lamneck	Rogers, Mass.
Andrew, Mass.	Englebright	Lehbach	Ryan
Andrews, N. Y.	Evans	Lemke	Sauthoff
Arends	Flesinger	Lord	Schneider, Wis.
Bacon	Fletcher	Ludlow	Scott
Blinderup	Focht	Lundeen	Secrest
Blackney	Gambrill	McGroarty	Seger
Boileau	Gehrman	McLean	Short
Brewster	Gifford	McLeod	Sisson
Brown, Mich.	Gilchrist	Maas	Smith, Conn.
Buckler, Minn.	Goldsborough	Main	Smith, Va.
Burdick	Goodwin	Mapes	Snell
Burham	Greenway	Marshall	Somers, N. Y.
Cannon, Wis.	Greever	Martin, Mass.	Stefan
Carlson	Guyne	May	Stewart
Carter	Gwynne	Michener	Sutphin
Celler	Halleck	Mott	Sweeney
Christianson	Hancock, N. Y.	O'Day	Taber
Church	Hart	O'Malley	Taylor, Tenn.
Citron	Harter	O'Neal	Thurston
Claiborne	Healey	Patterson	Tinkham
Cole, Md.	Hess	Perkins	Tobey
Cole, N. Y.	Higgins, Conn.	Pettengill	Wadsworth
Collins	Higgins, Mass.	Peyser	Wallgren
Cooper, Ohio	Hildebrandt	Pierce	Weich
Corning	Hill, Knute	Pittenger	Wigglesworth
Crawford	Hoffman	Plumley	Wilson, Pa.
Crosser, Ohio	Hollister	Powers	Withrow
Crowther	Holmes	Ransley	Wolcott
Culkin	Hope	Reece	Wolverton
Darrow	Hull	Reed, Ill.	Woodruff
Dirksen	Imhoff	Reed, N. Y.	Young
Ditter	Jenkins, Ohio	Reilly	Zioncheck
Dondero	Kahn	Rich	
Duffy, N. Y.	Kinzer	Richardson	

NAYS—225

Adair	Brooks	Coffee	DeRouen
Ashbrook	Brown, Ga.	Colden	Dickstein
Ayers	Buchanan	Colmer	Dies
Bankhead	Buck	Cooley	Dingell
Barden	Burch	Cooper, Tenn.	Disney
Barry	Caldwell	Cox	Dobbins
Beam	Cannon, Mo.	Cravens	Dorsey
Beiter	Carmichael	Creal	Doughton
Bell	Carpenter	Crosby	Doxey
Berlin	Cartwright	Cross, Tex.	Drewry
Biermann	Cary	Crowe	Driscoll
Bland	Casey	Cullen	Driver
Blanton	Castellow	Cummings	Duncan
Bloom	Chandler	Curley	Dunn, Miss.
Boehne	Chapman	Darden	Eagle
Boland	Clark, Idaho	Deen	Eckert
Boykin	Clark, N. C.	Delaney	Eicher
Boylan	Cochran	Dempsey	Faddis

Farley  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Flannagan  
Ford, Calif.  
Ford, Miss.  
Frey  
Fuller  
Fulmer  
Gasque  
Gildea  
Gillette  
Gingery  
Granfield  
Green  
Greenwood  
Gregory  
Griswold  
Haines  
Hamlin  
Hancock, N. C.  
Harlan  
Hennings  
Hill, Ala.  
Hill, Samuel B.  
Hobbs  
Hook  
Houston  
Huddleston  
Jacobsen  
Jenckes, Ind.  
Johnson, Okla.  
Johnson, Tex.  
Johnson, W. Va.  
Jones  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy, Md.  
Kenney

Kerr  
Kleberg  
Kloeb  
Kopplemann  
Kramer  
Lambeth  
Lanham  
Larrabee  
Lea, Calif.  
Lewis, Colo.  
Lucas  
Luckey  
McAndrews  
McClellan  
McCormack  
McFarlane  
McGehee  
McGrath  
McKeough  
McLaughlin  
McMillan  
McReynolds  
McSwain  
Mahon  
Maloney  
Mansfield  
Martin, Colo.  
Mason  
Massingale  
Maverick  
Meeks  
Merritt, N. Y.  
Miller  
Mitchell, Ill.  
Mitchell, Tenn.  
Monaghan  
Moran  
Moritz  
Murdoch

Nelson  
Nichols  
Norton  
O'Brien  
O'Connell  
O'Connor  
O'Leary  
Owen  
Palmisano  
Parks  
Parsons  
Patman  
Patton  
Pearson  
Peterson, Fla.  
Pfeifer  
Polk  
Rabaut  
Ramsay  
Ramspeck  
Randolph  
Rankin  
Rayburn  
Richards  
Robertson  
Robinson, Utah  
Rogers, N. H.  
Rogers, Okla.  
Romjue  
Rudd  
Sadowski  
Sanders, Tex.  
Schaefer  
Schuetz  
Schulte  
Scrugham  
Sears  
Shannon  
Sirovich

Smith, Wash.  
Smith, W. Va.  
Snyder, Pa.  
South  
Spence  
Stack  
Starnes  
Stubbs  
Sumners, Tex.  
Tarver  
Taylor, Colo.  
Taylor, S. C.  
Terry  
Thom  
Thomason  
Thompson  
Tolan  
Tonry  
Turner  
Umstead  
Utterback  
Vinson, Ga.  
Vinson, Ky.  
Walter  
Warren  
Wearin  
Weaver  
Werner  
West  
Whelchel  
White  
Whittington  
Wilcox  
Williams  
Wood  
Zimmerman

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Oklahoma, Mr. GASSAWAY, is unavoidably absent. If present, he would have voted "nay."

Mr. HIGGINS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues from Massachusetts, Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. CONNERY, are unavoidably absent on official business. If present, they would have voted "yea."

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. DIETRICH, is detained on account of illness. If present, he would have voted "nay."

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from West Virginia, Mr. KEE, is unavoidably absent on account of sickness. If present, he would have voted "nay."

Mr. GINGERY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. GRAY, is unavoidably absent. If present, he would have voted "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 267, nays 97, answered "present" 1, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]  
YEAS—267

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Costello

NOT VOTING—58

Bacharach  
Bolton  
Brennan  
Buckbee  
Buckley, N. Y.  
Bulwinkle  
Cavichia  
Connery  
Daly  
Dear  
Dietrich  
Dockweiler  
Doutrich  
Duffey, Ohio  
Eaton

Edmiston  
Ellenbogen  
Fenerty  
Fernandez  
Fish  
Gassaway  
Gavagan  
Gearhart  
Gray, Ind.  
Gray, Pa.  
Hartley  
Hoepfel  
Kee  
Kennedy, N. Y.  
Kocalkowski

Kvale  
Lambertson  
Lee, Okla.  
Lesinski  
Lewis, Md.  
Marcantonio  
Mead  
Merritt, Conn.  
Millard  
Montague  
Montet  
Oliver  
Peterson, Ga.  
Quinn  
Russell

Sabath  
Sanders, La.  
Sandlin  
Shanley  
Steagall  
Sullivan  
Thomas  
Treadway  
Turpin  
Underwood  
Wilson, La.  
Wolfenden  
Woodrum

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Eaton (for) with Mr. Mead (against).  
Mr. Lambertson (for) with Mr. Gassaway (against).  
Mr. Dockweiler (for) with Mr. Daly (against).  
Mr. Millard (for) with Mr. Dear (against).  
Mr. Cavichia (for) with Mr. Sullivan (against).  
Mr. Hartley (for) with Mr. Woodrum (against).  
Mr. Bolton (for) with Mr. Costello (against).  
Mr. Bacharach (for) with Mr. Lewis of Maryland (against).  
Mr. Marcantonio (for) with Mr. Bulwinkle (against).  
Mr. Gavagan (for) with Mr. Peterson of Georgia (against).  
Mr. Turpin (for) with Mr. Lesinski (against).  
Mr. Shanley (for) with Mr. Lee of Oklahoma (against).  
Mr. Doutrich (for) with Mr. Gray of Indiana (against).  
Mr. Treadway (for) with Mr. Buckley of New York (against).  
Mr. Thomas (for) with Mr. Underwood (against).  
Mr. Fish (for) with Mr. Edmiston (against).  
Mr. Wolfenden (for) with Mr. Fernandez (against).  
Mr. Merritt of Connecticut (for) with Mr. Dietrich (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Oliver with Mr. Buckbee.  
Mr. Kennedy of New York with Mr. Gearhart.  
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Kvale.  
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Fenerty.  
Mr. Duffey of Ohio with Mr. Sandlin.  
Mr. Montague with Mr. Russell.  
Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania with Mr. Brennan.  
Mr. Connery with Mr. Quinn.  
Mr. Kee with Mr. Montet.  
Mr. Wilson of Louisiana with Mr. Ellenbogen.  
Mr. Kocalkowski with Mr. Sanders of Louisiana.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WALLGREN and Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, on the roll call I voted "nay." I wish to withdraw my vote due to the fact I have a general pair with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. BOLTON.

Adair  
Allen  
Andresen  
Arends  
Ashbrook  
Ayers  
Bankhead  
Barden  
Barry  
Beam  
Beiter  
Bell  
Berlin  
Biermann  
Binderup  
Bland  
Blanton  
Bloom  
Boehne  
Boland  
Boykin  
Boylan  
Brown, Ga.  
Brown, Mich.  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Buckler, Minn.  
Burch  
Castell  
Caldwell  
Cannon, Mo.  
Carlson  
Carmichael  
Carpenter  
Cartwright  
Cary  
Castellow  
Chandler  
Chapman  
Christianson  
Clark, Idaho  
Clark, N. C.  
Cochran  
Coffee  
Colden  
Cole, Md.  
Colmer  
Cooley  
Cooper, Tenn.  
Cox  
Cravens  
Creal  
Crosby  
Cross, Tex.  
Crowe  
Cullen  
Cummings  
Curley  
Darden  
Deen  
Delaney  
Dempsey  
DeRouen

Dickstein  
Dies  
Dingell  
Dirksen  
Disney  
Dobbins  
Dorsey  
Doughton  
Doxey  
Drewry  
Driscoll  
Driver  
Duncan  
Dunn, Miss.  
Dunn, Pa.  
Eagle  
Eckert  
Eicher  
Evans  
Faddis  
Farley  
Ferguson  
Fiesinger  
Fitzpatrick  
Flannagan  
Fletcher  
Ford, Calif.  
Ford, Miss.  
Frey  
Fuller  
Fulmer  
Gambrell  
Gardner  
Gilchrist  
Gildea  
Gillette  
Gingery  
Goldsborough  
Green  
Greenwood  
Greene  
Gregory  
Griswold  
Guyer  
Gwynne  
Haines  
Halleck  
Hamlin  
Hancock, N. C.  
Harlan  
Hart  
Hennings  
Hildebrandt  
Hill, Ala.  
Hill, Knute  
Hill, Samuel B.  
Hobbs  
Hook  
Hope  
Houston  
Imhoff  
Jacobsen

Jenckes, Ind.  
Johnson, Okla.  
Johnson, Tex.  
Johnson, W. Va.  
Jones  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy, Md.  
Kenney  
Kerr  
Kinzer  
Kleberg  
Kloeb  
Kniffin  
Knutson  
Kocalkowski  
Kopplemann  
Kramer  
Lambeth  
Larrabee  
Lea, Calif.  
Lewis, Colo.  
Lucas  
Luckey  
Ludlow  
McAndrews  
McClellan  
McCormack  
McFarlane  
McGehee  
McGrath  
McKeough  
McLaughlin  
McMillan  
McReynolds  
Mahon  
Maloney  
Mansfield  
Marshall  
Martin, Colo.  
Mason  
Massingale  
Maverick  
Meeks  
Merritt, N. Y.  
Miller  
Mitchell, Ill.  
Mitchell, Tenn.  
Monaghan  
Moran  
Moritz  
Murdoch  
Nelson  
Nichols  
Norton  
O'Brien  
O'Connell  
O'Connor  
O'Day  
O'Leary  
Owen  
Palmisano

Parks  
Parsons  
Patman  
Patterson  
Patton  
Pearson  
Peterson, Fla.  
Pettengill  
Pfeifer  
Pierce  
Polk  
Rabaut  
Ramsay  
Ramspeck  
Randolph  
Rankin  
Rayburn  
Reece  
Reed, Ill.  
Relly  
Richards  
Robertson  
Robinson, Utah  
Rogers, N. H.  
Rogers, Okla.  
Romjue  
Rudd  
Ryan  
Sadowski  
Sanders, Tex.  
Schaefer  
Schuetz  
Schulte  
Scott  
Scrugham  
Sears  
Secret  
Shannon  
Sirovich  
Smith, Conn.  
Smith, Va.  
Smith, Wash.  
Smith, W. Va.  
South  
Spence  
Starnes  
Stefan  
Stubbs  
Sumners, Tex.  
Sutphin  
Tarver  
Taylor, Colo.  
Taylor, S. C.  
Taylor, Tenn.  
Terry  
Thom  
Thomason  
Thompson  
Thurston  
Tolan  
Tonry  
Turner

Umstead	Walter	Werner	Willcox
Utterback	Warren	West	Williams
Vinson, Ga.	Wearin	Whelchel	Wood
Vinson, Ky.	Weaver	White	Zimmerman
Wallgren	Welch	Whittington	

## NAYS—97

Amlie	Dondero	Lemke	Rogers, Mass.
Andrew, Mass.	Duffy, N. Y.	Lord	Sauthoff
Bacon	Engel	Lundeen	Schneider, Wis.
Blackney	Englebright	McGroarty	Seger
Boileau	Focht	McLean	Short
Brewster	Gehrmann	McLeod	Sisson
Burdick	Gifford	Maas	Snell
Burnham	Goodwin	Main	Somers, N. Y.
Cannon, Wis.	Granfield	Mapes	Stewart
Carter	Greenway	Martin, Mass.	Sweeney
Casey	Hancock, N. Y.	May	Taber
Celler	Harter	Michener	Tinkham
Church	Healey	Mott	Tobey
Citron	Hess	O'Malley	Wadsworth
Claiborne	Higgins, Conn.	O'Neal	Wigglesworth
Cole, N. Y.	Higgins, Mass.	Perkins	Wilson, Pa.
Collins	Hoffman	Peyster	Withrow
Cooper, Ohio	Hollister	Pittenger	Wolcott
Corning	Holmes	Plumley	Wolverton
Crawford	Huddleston	Powers	Woodruff
Crosser, Ohio	Hull	Ransley	Young
Crowther	Jenkins, Ohio	Reed, N. Y.	Zioncheck
Culkin	Kahn	Rich	
Darrow	Lamneck	Risk	
Ditter	Leibach	Robison, Ky.	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Costello

## NOT VOTING—65

Andrews, N. Y.	Edmiston	Lanham	Sanders, La.
Bacharach	Ekwall	Lee, Okla.	Sandlin
Bolton	Ellenbogen	Lesinski	Shanley
Brennan	Fenerty	Lewis, Md.	Snyder, Pa.
Brooks	Fernandez	McSwain	Stack
Buckbee	Fish	Marcantonio	Steagall
Buckley, N. Y.	Gassaway	Mead	Sullivan
Bulwinkle	Gavagan	Merritt, Conn.	Thomas
Cavichia	Gearhart	Millard	Treadway
Connery	Gray, Ind.	Montague	Turpin
Daly	Gray, Pa.	Montet	Underwood
Dear	Hartley	Oliver	Wilson, La.
Dietrich	Hoepfel	Peterson, Ga.	Wolfenden
Dockweller	Kee	Quinn	Woodrum
Doutrich	Kennedy, N. Y.	Richardson	
Duffey, Ohio	Kvale	Russell	
Eaton	Lambertson	Sabath	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. Mead (for) with Mr. Eaton (against).  
 Mr. Lambertson (for) with Mr. Dockweller (against).  
 Mr. Gassaway (for) with Mr. Andrews of New York (against).  
 Mr. Dear (for) with Mr. Millard (against).  
 Mr. Sullivan (for) with Mr. Cavichia (against).  
 Mr. Woodrum (for) with Mr. Hartley (against).  
 Mr. Costello (for) with Mr. Bolton (against).  
 Mr. Lewis of Maryland (for) with Mr. Bacharach (against).  
 Mr. Bulwinkle (for) with Mr. Marcantonio (against).  
 Mr. Peterson of Georgia (for) with Mr. Gavagan (against).  
 Mr. Lesinski (for) with Mr. Turpin (against).  
 Mr. Lee of Oklahoma (for) with Mr. Shanley (against).  
 Mr. Gray of Indiana (for) with Mr. Doutrich (against).  
 Mr. Buckley of New York (for) with Mr. Treadway (against).  
 Mr. Brooks (for) with Mr. Thomas (against).  
 Mr. Daly (for) with Mr. Ekwall (against).  
 Mr. Fernandez (for) with Mr. Wolfenden (against).  
 Mr. Dietrich (for) with Mr. Merritt of Connecticut (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Oliver with Mr. Buckbee.  
 Mr. Kennedy of New York with Mr. Gearhart.  
 Mr. Steagall with Mr. Kvale.  
 Mr. Edmiston with Mr. Fish.  
 Mr. Duffey of Ohio with Mr. Sandlin.  
 Mr. Montague with Mr. Russell.  
 Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania with Mr. Brennan.  
 Mr. Connery with Mr. Quinn.  
 Mr. Kee with Mr. Montet.  
 Mr. Wilson of Louisiana with Mr. Ellenbogen.  
 Mr. Sanders of Louisiana with Mr. Sabath.  
 Mr. McSwain with Mr. Richardson.  
 Mr. Stack with Mr. Lanham.  
 Mr. Snyder of Pennsylvania with Mr. Underwood.

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. KEE, is unavoidably absent. Had he been present, he would have voted "aye."

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. EDMISTON, is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "aye."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. GASSAWAY, is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "aye."

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. DIETRICH, is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "aye."

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. RUSSELL, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. CONNERY, are unavoidably absent on official business. If present, they would vote "no."

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, on the last roll call I voted "aye." I have a general pair with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. BOLTON, and I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS—SOIL CONSERVATION

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Speaker, since 1933 there has been a steady and pronounced improvement in the economic state of the farmer and his family in my district, largely the direct result of the benefits extended the producing agriculturalist under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which the Supreme Court of the United States recently declared unconstitutional.

Control of production, with the immediate following of improved prices for the farmer's products, aside from the direct benefits of the subsidy feature of the act, undoubtedly caused by far the greater portion of the improvement in economic conditions in agricultural territory.

In my district and in my State farmers were beginning to feel that life for them once more held hope, and the decision of the Supreme Court left thousands of farmers wondering what the future would hold. Many felt that all hope was lost. Others believed that this administration, as in the past, would come to the front with plans and action to take care of the situation.

The Agricultural Committees of the House and the Senate, bearing in mind the Supreme Court's decision in the A. A. A. case, and with the vast knowledge gained through exhaustive studies of the agricultural situation over the period of the past few years, accepted the recommendations of the United States Department of Agriculture, and brought forth the bill, S. 3780, which we are now considering.

This bill, while not attacking the problem as directly as did the Agricultural Adjustment Act, in my mind provides the necessary ways and means of continuing Federal aid in solving the problem of loss of income to the farming peoples.

In many respects this bill is far superior to the old law, as this legislation looks well into the future, and makes provisions for sound national planning for the future welfare of the farmers by providing a sound system of planning and action for the preservation of the soil resources of the Nation.

In years past competent engineers and scientists of the Department of Agriculture have made exhaustive studies of the problem of exhaustion of the soil resources of the Nation, with findings that concluded that in the not distant future agriculture would be beset with the problem of producing from unfertile fields sufficient produce to make their efforts worth while. The warning has been given that in the not distant future this Nation would face a situation of being unable to provide sufficient basic agricultural commodities to supply the normal needs of our own people.

What better time than now, when we are faced with a definite overproduction of basic farm products, which overproduction, coupled with a condition of enforced subnormal consumption on the part of the consuming public, when farm prices have been climbing through our past several months of crop-production control toward the normal levels, could we possibly find to attack this problem from a national standpoint?

This act, "to provide for protection of land resources against soil erosion, and for the preservation and improvement of soil fertility, the promotion of economic use and conservation of land, the reduction of exploitation and wasteful, unscientific use of national soil resources, the pro-

tection of rivers and harbors against the result of soil erosion, in aid of maintaining the navigability of waters and water courses, and in the aid of flood control—elements of vital importance to millions of acres of farm lands—and reestablishment and maintenance of farmers' purchasing power", will doubtless go down in history as the most vitally important legislation ever designed for the benefit of all the people of the Nation.

Little need be said regarding the economic factor of reviving business through the medium of reviving the purchasing power of the agricultural people. We are all agreed on that point. During the past 2 years in particular we have seen the vast improvement in business conditions generally, the vast improvement in industry and commerce, resulting from the improvement in the farmers' buying power which has already been affected.

My district, in which the people are well divided between the classes of agricultural producers and employees of industry and commerce, is an outstanding example of these facts, referred to by some as simple truths of economics.

This act proposes and provides for a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities adequate to meet the consumer demand at prices fair to both producers and consumers.

Aside from partisan political opposition I have heard no opposition to this legislation from the people of my district. However, farmers of my district assembled in conventions and assemblages in practically every township of every county have petitioned me to support this bill. They believe in its purposes and have faith in the results that will be achieved. This expression from the people of my district, it follows naturally, leads me to believe that we can anticipate wholehearted support and cooperation from the agricultural people, and such support guarantees the results we seek.

If means can be found to rehabilitate the agricultural industry by methods not in conflict with the Constitution, the national welfare will be promoted. This bill proposes to meet the problems in conformity with the Constitution. I believe that it meets the problem and that it conforms with the constitutional principles set out in the A. A. A. decision of the Supreme Court.

I have been profoundly interested in the words of Justice Roberts in the A. A. A. decision, in which he said:

None (speaking of powers) to regulate agricultural production is given, and therefore legislation by Congress for that purpose is forbidden.

In this statement the challenge to Congress—to the people of the Nation—is issued. We had felt that the general-welfare clause of the Constitution was broad enough to cover such emergencies as the emergency which faced agriculture at the outset of the Roosevelt administration. Justice Roberts and the majority of the Supreme Court say "No."

Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Henry A. Wallace, speaking in Indianapolis, Ind., recently, recalled the Dred Scott decision which plagued President Lincoln and his administration. Lincoln, fighting to preserve the Union and for principles he felt were right, found that decision definitely blocking his plans for abolition of slavery in the Territories.

Referring to the Court's decision, and speaking of the Constitution, Lincoln said:

I took an oath that I would, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. . . . I understand, however, that my oath to preserve the Constitution . . . imposed upon me the duty of preserving, by every indispensable means, that Government, that Nation, of which the Constitution was the organic law. Was it possible to lose the Nation and yet preserve the Constitution? By general law, life and limb must be protected; yet often a limb must be amputated to save a life; but a life is never wisely given to save a limb.

It is clear that Lincoln meant that preservation of the Constitution was secondary to the preservation of the Nation.

It is just as clear now that if we should find that we are blocked by the present provisions of the Constitution in our efforts to save agriculture from utter ruin, saving of the Con-

stitution, which I am sworn to uphold, preserve, and defend, must of necessity be amended to save agriculture.

However, I do not feel that the present situation is as acute as many would have us believe. There are those who have already declared this new legislation—

To promote the conservation and profitable use of agricultural land resources by temporary Federal aid to farmers and by providing for a permanent policy of Federal aid to States for such purposes—

will not be sustained if attacked before the Supreme Court. I think this legislation is constitutional. But if it should result that the Court holds otherwise, I see but one avenue open—that of constitutional amendment.

One noted writer, whose articles appear in the Scripps-Howard publications, forecasts that the new farm bill will be held unconstitutional. In his analysis of the law he assumes that the primary purpose of the law is control of production and prices. He points out that the Court has declared such power beyond the limits permitted the Congress.

It is my belief that control of production and prices would follow as the result of the primary purposes of the law—conservation of soil resources. If the Court should hold that Congress has no authority to legislate to conserve our soil resources, because it should follow in the natural course of economic events that control of production and prices would result, then it will follow as surely as the night follows day that we will be faced with the insistent demand of the people for constitutional amendment.

The Constitution has been amended many times. It will be amended again. I do not think that it will be necessary to amend the organic law of the Nation to save the basic industry of the Nation from destruction, because I believe the new farm law will be found constitutional. However, we may as well assume that as a possibility and be ready to meet it.

Those who are pessimistic of the outcome evidently have read with great caution the statement in the A. A. A. decision which reads:

It is an established principle that the attainment of a prohibited end may not be accomplished under the pretext of the exertion of powers which are granted.

The methods proposed by the bill to accomplish its purposes are twofold. First, the bill provides for grants to States to enable them to carry out their own programs for agricultural rehabilitation.

In the A. A. A. decision the Court stated that—

Powers not specifically granted or reasonably to be implied from such as are conferred are to be reserved to the States or the people.

In order to receive Federal aid under this bill a State must submit to the Secretary of Agriculture a plan which has as its objective the carrying out of any one or more of the specified purposes of the new Federal farm law during a given year. The Secretary is to approve the State plan if he finds it is likely to do so, if he finds that the plan and other plans submitted by other States warrant going ahead under them to carry out the plans, and if the particular State plan is designed to do what can reasonably be regarded as that State's share. Safeguards are provided under which the Secretary can assure that the money given the State by the Federal Government is being properly spent and that the spending of the money will continue to effectuate the purposes of the Federal law. Provision for fair distribution of Federal moneys among the cooperating States is carefully set out.

The only limitations on the type of State plan which may secure Federal aid are those limitations which will provide for proper administration of the plan and for securing coordination of State plans on a national scale. The bill provides for decentralization of administration activity and provides for participation in the execution of the plans by producers.

We have no indication and no precedents which indicate that the Court will declare Congress powerless to provide aid to the States for such purposes. I see no danger of this feature of the law which is designed to provide for permanent future conservation activity being held unconstitutional.

The bill also adds a new section, temporary in its operation, to the Soil Erosion Act. Under its terms the Secretary of Agriculture is given power to make payments or other grants of aid to agricultural producers to encourage farming practices designed to result in preservation and improvement of soil fertility, promotion of the economic use of land, and curtailment of exploitation and unprofitable use of national soil resources. The Secretary is given no independent power—which the Supreme Court has challenged—under the temporary plan to provide for a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities or to provide for reestablishing and maintaining farm purchasing power. Such payments or grants are to be conditioned upon such utilization of land as the Secretary finds has tended to accomplish the purposes specifically provided by the act. The amount to be paid to each producer for carrying out soil-conservation practices is to be based upon the treatment or use of land for soil conservation and restoration or the prevention of erosion, as the case may be; changes in the use of land; or a domestic-allotment percentage. The Secretary is to take into consideration the productivity of the land affected in making any payments based on land use.

The Secretary is expressly denied the power to enter into contracts binding any producer to any course of action or to acquire any land or right or interest in land under the bill.

This feature of the new law might well be called the stopgap feature. It is undeniably intended to provide ways and means of progressing toward the proposed goal during that period of time required for the States to set up their own plans.

In several States plans are already under way. In Indiana the agricultural extension service has held a number of county and township meetings designed to acquaint the producers with the plans proposed in this act. State officials are keeping well informed on these plans, and organized agriculture in those States where State officials are not yet aroused to the necessity of such legislation are planning to go before the legislatures requesting full State cooperation with the Federal program.

This feature of the new law is specifically temporary, and no grant or payment under the second section, above outlined, can be made after December 31, 1937. By that time it is anticipated most States at least will have come under or had an opportunity to come under the plans designated in the first section of the law.

It is apparent that if no provision is made for soil conservation prior to the time when State activity becomes effective, the task of the States will be greater and, as a consequence, the expenditures of the Federal Government will be greater.

The Supreme Court, to use this Court's words, has held that a temporary plan is not a statutory plan to regulate and control agricultural production, and the objects of this plan are specifically stated to be soil conservation and powers conferred are only such powers as are needed to carry out this purpose.

It is the consensus of opinion that the Supreme Court did not, in the A. A. A. decision, condemn conditional expenditures not in pursuance of a contract which have as their object the accomplishment of a purpose to promote the general welfare. The Court, however, did say:

There is an obvious difference between a statute stating the conditions upon which moneys shall be expended and one effective only upon assumption of a contractual obligation to submit to a regulation which otherwise could not be enforced.

Under the temporary plan, each producer is completely free to do as he pleases with his farm. There is no coercion

upon him to change his practices, to adopt any particular practice, or to fail to adopt any practice. The farmer has complete freedom of choice and the Secretary of Agriculture is entirely forbidden from any action to bind the farmer in any choice.

This new bill also provides, among other things, for the expansion of foreign and domestic markets, the search for new markets, and the disposition of any accumulated surpluses which may be stagnating local markets.

Before closing I should like to point out that even though the A. A. A. Act was declared unconstitutional, during the period of its operation prices of commodities generally produced in my State increased greatly to the ultimate and decided advantage of the producer.

From December 1932 to December 1935 wheat prices climbed from 31 to 90 cents per bushel; corn from 18 to 53 cents per bushel; hogs from \$2.73 per hundredweight to \$8.72 per hundredweight; wholesale milk from \$1.26 per hundredweight to \$1.86 per hundredweight; and butterfat from 21 to 33 cents per pound.

We have gone forward consistently under the old law, which is now lost, and I feel we shall continue to go forward under the new law which we are now enacting.

I feel also that the permanent features of the new law are much to be desired and that the future of agriculture will be adequately safeguarded under these provisions.

#### MILITARY ROAD

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 488) to close Military Road, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. SNELL. Is this the Military Road across the river here?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

"That permission is hereby granted to the National Airport Corporation to use as a part of the runway of its airport located near the city of Washington, D. C., such part of the road commonly known as Military Road as may be necessary to connect the two parts of the said airport now separated by the said road; that part of the road to be used for such runway to be determined by the Department of Commerce: *Provided*, That the part of the road hereinabove described shall continue in use as a public road and be open to the public, as contemplated by the act of Congress approved August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 569, 583), except when necessarily closed during its use for the landing and taking off of airplanes: *And provided further*, That the permission herein granted shall be effective only so long as the said National Airport Corporation provides, maintains, and operates such traffic signals or other safety devices as shall be approved by the Department of Commerce to protect airplane and vehicular traffic on and over the part of the road herein authorized to be used.

"Sec. 2. Any person who knowingly, during its use for the landing or taking off of airplanes, enters, attempts to enter, or who at any time parks upon that part of the road herein authorized to be used shall be punished by a fine not to exceed \$500 or imprisoned not to exceed 6 months, or both.

"Sec. 3. Jurisdiction over offenses committed in violation of this joint resolution is hereby vested in the nearest commissioner, judge, or court of the United States having jurisdiction in the premises.

"Sec. 4. Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this joint resolution."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to provide for safeguarding of traffic on Military Road."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by myself in Boston recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I delivered in Boston, Mass., on February 15, 1936:

It is a pleasure to come here to greet the friends I met a few years ago and discuss the political situation as it appears today. Then, too, I am reminded that this city is the home of my very good friends, JOHN MCCORMACK and JOHN HIGGINS, both of whom ably represent you in the United States House of Representatives. Indeed I may say in truth that no Member of the House enjoys a greater respect and affection than does your distinguished Representative, JOHN MCCORMACK. His ability, sincerity, and fair-play attitude is appreciated and acknowledged by all our colleagues, particularly the powerful Ways and Means Committee of the House, of which he is a member.

JOHN HIGGINS, too, is a very great credit to your good judgment. Although a comparatively new Member, already his ability and fine personality are recognized by every Member with whom he comes in contact. I do not hesitate to predict a very successful service in Congress for him and sincerely hope Boston will return JOHN MCCORMACK and JOHN HIGGINS to serve you for many years to come.

Someone has slipped a note to ask me what I think of Mr. CONNERY. Well, of course, you must know that BILLY CONNERY is one of the most beloved Members in Congress. Even when disagreeing with Billy we love him just the same. He is very kind and considerate and at the same time a great fighter. And when it comes to the people he represents, well, I can tell you we almost feel we have a bowing acquaintance with every person in Lynn. As chairman of the Labor Committee BILLY CONNERY is doing a fine job. As ranking member of that committee I am in a position to tell you that he deserves your confidence, your gratitude, and your votes.

And now I am going into the subject of my talk, but, first, may I not take a few minutes to express my sincere appreciation of the efforts most of you must have made to come here today. I cannot recall a worse storm at any time. Those of you who are here from the northern and western part of the State must have experienced great difficulty in traveling and your presence goes to prove something we have come to realize during the past few very strenuous years—that the women of the country can be depended upon for service if and when we are needed, and probably at no time in our history have we been needed more than we are today. I know it is because of this fact and of your loyalty that you are here in such numbers. You realize that vicious forces are at work trying to undermine our faith in one of the greatest humanitarians of all time—our beloved President. I like to think that those of us who understand all that has been accomplished during the past 3 hectic years will stand shoulder to shoulder in the work ahead and prove in the election this year that we are grateful for all that has been accomplished by the administration under the leadership of President Roosevelt.

I like to think, too, that women, because of their obligations to the home and to improving social conditions in their communities as well as in the Nation, are preparing with facts and figures to prove that the New Deal is and has been a vital force in improving the economic conditions of hundreds of thousands of our citizens, many of whom in 1933 had lost not only their savings, their homes, their business, but that which is of more importance, their courage. To me that was the most pitiful part of the whole depression. During 1929, 1930, 1931, and 1932 the records disclose the greatest number of suicides of any period in our history. Strong men and women lost not only their material possessions but their mental stability as well, and broken in spirit they sought what seemed to them the only way out.

It was a sad period and those selfish men and women who are now crying loudest about the Constitution in their efforts to destroy the work of 3 years of constructive effort on the part of an administration devoted to the welfare of all the people of this great land might well compare the record of the Hoover administration with that of the New Deal. If then they continue to decry the accomplishments indicated, it may well be said of them that their selfishness has taken possession of their conscience.

It might be well to discuss here the subject about which you invited me to talk today, "the accomplishments of the Roosevelt administration." I feel inadequate to do justice to this subject, but at least I shall try to tell you in simple language what seems to be most important. When I say that those of us who are Democrats can look back upon our 3 years of stewardship of national affairs with a feeling of pride, I know you will agree with me, and I know we can look toward the future with confidence and with faith in the unflinching ability of the American people to recognize and appreciate honest, unselfish effort, and to place the stamp of approbation upon a job well done, undertaken in a time of great national stress, during a period of serious emergency, when fear and apprehension were widespread; when rumblings of discontent were becoming more and more pronounced, when the general welfare of the Nation truly was at the crossroads and called for immediate, definite, courageous action.

Nobody reading the record of accomplishment since March 1933 who compares it with the previous 3 years of inaction can fail to acknowledge that President Roosevelt has done a man-sized job for the people of this great country. The newspapers tell the story far

better than I can. Not the front pages, but the financial and industrial reports. If you doubt what I tell you, get a copy of your favorite newspaper as of March 1933 and place alongside of it a copy of the same newspaper of this date. You will find figures that will amaze you. If you continue your investigation, you will find that our exports have increased almost 150 percent, imports about 95 percent, construction contracts in 37 States 213 percent, life insurance written shows an increase of approximately 10 percent, newspaper advertising an increase of more than 50 percent. In the retail sales and chain stores—18 chains—we have an increase of over 30 percent, rural sales—general merchandise—an increase of 118 percent, variety stores—5-and-10 stores—an increase of almost 25 percent, department stores an increase of almost 50 percent, industrial production an increase of about 65 percent, and so the story goes; and it is the same with respect to all industry, all business throughout the Nation. This is a steady, healthy improvement, increased production, larger pay rolls, greater revenues, and added dividends.

In your own State, Massachusetts, income taxes collected in 1933 aggregated \$35,169,560; in 1935 the total collection amounted to \$50,882,728. Miscellaneous tax collections for 1933 totaled \$14,219,010, whereas those in 1935 aggregated \$43,386,934. Total employment for the month of October 1935 showed a gain of over 25 percent over March 1933. Pay rolls for the same period showed a gain of almost 50 percent. Is not this a record to feel proud of?

One hears much glib talk of regimentation, of Constitution safeguards, and of rugged individualism. Who cares about all that when we know that the only real test in any undertaking is that of accomplishment?

We know that under the leadership of President Roosevelt our savings banks, commercial banks, and trust companies are now in a healthy condition. The number of individual bank accounts on July 1 was the largest on record, nearly 14,000,000. Insurance companies, protectors of the destinies of many millions of families, are today as strong as ever in their history. Recovery came through wise legislation, sound and careful supervision, and the great advance not only in the value of securities but in the value of mortgages on farms, homes, and business properties. As to manufacturers and merchants, many facing bankruptcy in 1932 are now definitely on the way up, and some have reached 1929 level of production. I quote from Thomas J. Watson, president of one of our largest corporations:

"Industrial activity stands at 80 percent as compared with 1929. Pig-iron production, a basic industry, was more than one-fourth greater in 11 months of 1935 than in 1934, one and one-half the output of 1933, and more than two and a quarter times that of 1932. Net earnings of all industrial corporations in 9 months of 1935 were 29 percent above 1934 and 54 percent above 1933. Corporate-share values increased 32 percent in 1935 and 97 percent during the past 3 years. There was not a single failure on the New York Stock Exchange during 1935."

These statements from a man who is a leader in the industrial and business world represent definite accomplishments and should furnish much food for thought in appraising the work of the President and of the Congress during the past 3 years. They are facts, clear and convincing. On and before March 4, 1933, the Nation was on the threshold of economic chaos and worse. Poverty, destitution, hunger, business stagnation, bankruptcies, and despair were widespread. Today even our enemies will concede that the clouds have lifted and that courage has taken the place of despair in the heart of the average person.

The important thing to us is that the Nation has progressed, has found firmer ground, and is going on to better things. The Republican administration during 3 full years after the crash in the fall of 1929 had not the ability nor the courage to suggest or carry through a program that probably would have prevented the frightful condition confronting President Roosevelt when he assumed leadership of our country in March 1933. The American people are prone to forget, but I do not believe we shall soon forget the do-nothing leadership of Mr. Hoover and his party during the most trying period within the memory of most of us. I still insist that the American people are grateful, and it is because of this faith that I know they will listen to all of the arguments presented and weigh them on the scales of justice.

The task we have before us is to present our case. It is not a difficult case, for it is built upon facts. Cold logic may be substituted for emotionalism and the jury of millions who have been benefited through the legislation enacted under the leadership of a man who placed the necessity of restoring courage to a nation above any other consideration can be depended upon to render a fair verdict on election day. Any good lawyer tries his case on facts. I have tried to give you facts in this case. It is up to you, the workers in the Democratic Party, to present your facts to the people of this great State. The issue is clear-cut. On one side we have the do-nothing policy of the Hoover administration and on the other 3 years of intensive planning to benefit all the people of this great Nation. We do not ask you to approve every act. We do ask you to render your verdict on the results achieved.

In considering the achievements let your conscience guide you and ask yourselves these questions: Is the Constitution of my country in danger because the administration provided the means to feed the hungry? Or because millions of jobless have been given jobs; because thousands of boys, idle and desperate, were

given an opportunity to work in camps provided for them; because the farmer has been assured a reasonable price for the product of his toil; because the natural resources of the Nation, grabbed by beneficiaries of special privilege in the days of the "Invisible Government", have been restored to the people; because the investment securities and bank savings of a lifetime have been made secure against the sharp practices and high-pressure finance that destroyed most of us? We hear so much of the Constitution these days and of the fear of "inciting class warfare." I am not the least bit worried about the Constitution. The very people who talk most about it are those who may well ask themselves whether or not they have honestly lived up to even the preamble to that Constitution. As for "inciting class warfare", we need only ask ourselves a few questions on that subject. Is it "inciting class warfare" to secure for the worker just compensation for honest toil, to reduce hours of labor to a plane consistent with the requirements of health, or to remove the underprivileged from city plague spots, germ-laden, crime-breeding tenement hovels, to decent habitations that will bring health, happiness, and contentment?

The honest people of this country must acknowledge that the Farm Credit Administration saved thousands of farms and farmers. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation saved thousands of city and suburban homes. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation galvanized into new and vigorous life, saved hundreds of banks, railroads, industry, and came to the rescue of depositors in closed banks. The Federal Emergency Relief Administration cared for more than 10,000,000 of destitute people. The Civilian Conservation Corps took a million youngsters off our city streets and gave them wholesome, useful occupation, and in doing so probably prevented many from becoming habitual criminals. A Federal Housing Administration stimulated home modernization and new construction.

A Public Works Administration with its millions for great and necessary projects spent on 50,000 miles of highway alone approximately \$1,200,000,000, not to mention the many other useful works. In addition, the Administration has guaranteed the safety of bank deposits, placed a legal check nationally on selling worthless stocks and bonds, preventing men like Insull from robbing the public through stock-promotion corporations, exposed by investigations the outrageously large salaries, bonuses, and graft by which members of the "invisible government" at the head of large corporations and banks fleeced their stockholders and customers, aided States, counties, and cities in caring for the poor and giving work to the unemployed, thus easing the burden of local taxation; and it is in this connection that we may say had it not been for the aid of the Government, many of our cities would be bankrupt today. It reformed the banking system of the country, saved our gold supply, and maintained the soundest currency in the world. It restored living prices to farmers, strengthened and modernized our neutrality laws to prevent our becoming involved in other people's wars. And while the national debt was increased seven and one-half billion dollars, the value of all property under Roosevelt was increased many times that amount.

These are some of the accomplishments that according to the distinguished constitutional lawyers of Wall Street have placed the Constitution in jeopardy, have delivered the country to the Socialists, and have "incited class warfare." You know it is singularly ungrateful that some of our bank executives, our industrialists, our big businessmen, and others who pleaded in 1933, "Save us or we perish", and who have been saved, are loudest among those who now cry, "Down with Roosevelt!" They are loudest among those who now cry, "Give us back the Grand Old Party, the party of Harding and Hoover." Now that they are out of the red they want the party back in power that put them in the red. There must be some powerful reason, some great, impelling motive that has caused these leaders of big business to turn and bite the hand that has fed them. Is it because they yearn for the good old days of "go-as-you-please", the days of no regulation of special privilege, of uncontrolled pillage and plunder? Are they irked because the Government at Washington has exposed and laid bare before the people of the Nation some of the wizardry permitted under Republican administration that brought the Nation to the threshold of economic chaos or worse? Do they resent the existence in the Federal statute books of the Securities Act, which has placed rigid control over stock transactions, or the legislation that prevents crooked stock-exchange practices?

In reviewing the case we have, you must marshal all of these forces to your side and present them to the people who, through a Republican-controlled press, rarely hear the true account of the 3 years of administration under the leadership of President Roosevelt. I am not criticizing the press. It is an old story that the press must listen to the voice of those responsible for its success; and while the front pages and editorials may be against the administration, as I have said before, the financial and industrial pages are all for it. So take your choice as to what you think is the honest story, and remember that the voice that will be heard at the polls next November will be that of those who are not looking for any special privilege—just hoping and praying that they may have the opportunity guaranteed under our Constitution, the inalienable right to work and live happily under the protection of a just government. And because the great majority will feel that these rights are safer in the hands of an administration which regards the welfare of the masses as of greater importance than those of special privilege, I believe without the shadow of a doubt

that Franklin Delano Roosevelt will be renominated and reelected President of the United States next November.

In conclusion, may I say that I came to you in 1932 asking you to support another candidate, one I had reason to believe then would be the best fitted to assume leadership of our great party? Today I am glad to acknowledge before this same audience that I was mistaken. I have served 3 years in Congress under the leadership of President Roosevelt, and do not hesitate to say that no leader could have given more unselfish service nor could any man have accomplished more to benefit humanity than has our President under the most adverse circumstances. Circumstances that have tried the souls of most of us. His courage and his faith have been a source of great inspiration to me and if we followed him blindly, as many seem to think, it was a blindness we are proud of. We offer no apologies for our record. We feel that in the years to come, when partisanship has given way to sane thinking and final appraisals made of the Roosevelt administration, history will record that in 3 years social legislation, contemplated and dreamed of for many years by all who believe in the brotherhood of man, became an actual fact years before any of us had hoped so great a change could take place. There has been much misunderstanding and probably it has been largely because it is difficult to digest so many new laws in so short a time. That is unfortunate, but those of us who were close to the picture have and do realize it was necessary. The emergency compelled us to act quickly and the future will bear witness that we acted wisely. Expenditures have been and will continue to be large, but not much larger than those of the World War when our American billions were spent on a war to destroy and did destroy the flower of our American manhood and little opposition was heard about that spending.

The war we are financing today is a war on depression, and its sole purpose is to create happiness—not tragedy. Instead of death and desolation, its objective is to increase hope and courage, to destroy fear, that horrible thing that through 4 years almost succeeded in destroying the spirit of America. Is it too high a price to pay? Do you not agree with our President in his endeavor to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, and to instill into your heart and mine the faith, the hope, and the courage to go forward to better things? His responsibility is our responsibility. The question we must ask ourselves is this, Are we to go forward with a sound, liberal, economic Government, concerned with the happiness of all the people, or shall we turn our back on the advantages we have gained to follow the leadership of selfishly organized interests that either could not or would not hear the cries of distress echoed throughout the length and breadth of our land only a few short years ago. It is our problem, not the problem of President Roosevelt. Our welfare is at stake, not his; and it will be our decision at the polls next November that shall determine whether or not we select the flag of special privilege or that of unselfish devotion as exemplified by the accomplishments of the New Deal under the leadership of a great President—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

#### PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and present a resolution for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### House Resolution 425

*Resolved*, That the bill (S. 3410) to exempt from taxation receipts from the operation of Olympic games if donated to the State of California, the city of Los Angeles, and the county of Los Angeles, in the opinion of this House contravenes that clause of the Constitution of the United States requiring revenue bills to originate in the House of Representatives, and is an infringement of the prerogative of this House, and that said bill be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. COOPER of Tennessee, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

#### REPEAL OF COTTON, TOBACCO, AND POTATO ACTS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 11138) to extinguish tax liabilities and tax liens arising out of the Tobacco, Cotton, and Potato Acts, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this bill does what the gentleman thought he was doing with a bill of similar nature passed a short time ago, but which was not properly worded.

Mr. JONES. Yes. One part of it was doubtful. There is some question about whether the tax itself was technically released.

Mr. SNELL. And there is nothing new about this except that?

Mr. JONES. Except that, and to make sure that we repeal all three of those acts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the act entitled "An act to repeal the Kerr Tobacco Act, the Bankhead Cotton Act of 1934, and the Potato Act of 1935", approved February 10, 1936, is amended by striking out "; and all liens for taxes imposed as provided in subdivision (f) of section 4 of Public Law No. 169 are hereby canceled and released," and inserting in lieu thereof a period and the following: "No tax, civil penalty, or interest which accrued under any provision of law repealed by this act and which is uncollected on the date of the enactment of this act shall be collected; and all liens for taxes, civil penalties, or interest arising out of taxes under such provisions of law are canceled and released."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

ELIAS DUKE

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 4086, for the relief of Elias Duke, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 4086, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "\$1,750" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ESTIMATED NET INCOME OF OPERATING FARMERS IN THE UNITED STATES COMPARED WITH THE NET INCOME OF ALL BUSINESS CORPORATIONS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a tabulation in order to complete my statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

ESTIMATED NET INCOME OF OPERATING FARMERS IN THE UNITED STATES COMPARED WITH THE NET INCOME OF ALL BUSINESS CORPORATIONS

There is much popular misunderstanding as to the real financial position of our farming population, due to inadequate knowledge of the facts. Also, for many millions of people, farming in the United States has traditionally been a "mode of living" rather than a commercial business, and so cannot properly be measured by the usual business standards.

Figures recently compiled by the United States Department of Agriculture, but not publicly disseminated, indicate that for the year 1934 the average operating farmer in the United States realized a net return of 4.4 percent on his "net capital", after the most liberal allowance for all expenses, and after the inclusion of many noncapital items in the investment account. This was the highest rate of return since 1925, and unquestionably 1935 will show an even more satisfactory situation. For the same year, 1934, all business corporations in the United States showed an estimated loss of 1.3 percent on their invested capital.

However, the real return to the farmer was much higher than the Government figures at first indicate.

The Department of Agriculture in its estimates of the operating farmers' "net capital" includes dwellings and passenger automobiles amounting in the aggregate to several billions of dollars in value. Neither of these items are a part of the investment, which for comparative purposes enters into the cost of producing farm products. Accordingly, in the attached tabulation they have been eliminated.

Further, the farmers' "costs" were built up on some remarkably "liberal" assumptions:

(a) Depreciation of 5 percent on all farm buildings was figured, and at 21 percent on all farm implements and machinery, including passenger cars. The Government commentator states that even in 1934 the depreciation figured as cost, \$789,000,000, was almost \$300,000,000 in excess of what the farmers spent for replacement and repairs of all capital items. (See Crops and Markets, July 1935, p. 272.)

(b) Actual wages paid to hired labor were increased by 37½ percent for assumed cost of board and other perquisites.

(c) The current rate of wages was assumed for the farm operator and the working members of his family and deducted as a part of the costs. The aggregate wages of the family thus estimated for 1934 amounted to \$2,586,000,000, or almost seven times as great as the actual cash wages of \$377,000,000 paid to "hired" labor.

(d) Again, the farmers' income has been credited with the value of products raised and consumed on the farm, valued at current local prices received by the farmer for similar products. However, this figure has no comparative relation to the amount customarily paid for corresponding items by that 75 percent of our population who do not live on farms. It has been conservatively estimated that the average nonfarmer would, on the average, pay two or three times as high a price for such items as the Government here credits to the operating farmer. Hence for comparative purposes, and in order to show more nearly the true income position, the Government's estimates of income from this source—in kind—have been doubled.

(e) Finally, in the operating farmers' net income no allowance was made for the large amount—probably at least hundreds of millions of dollars—received by farm operators for work other than agricultural production, such as part-time work in industry, part-time work for other farmers, income from boarders and tourists, income from small manufacturing and handicraft work of various sorts, work on the roads, trucking, and so forth. If such an adjustment could be included the rate of return would be substantially increased.

After making conservative adjustments for some of the above-mentioned factors, but without cutting the abnormally high depreciation rates, and without crediting the farmers' income with the large receipts from working sources other than agricultural production, we find that for the year 1934 the estimated net return on the operators' net capital—value of farm property less indebtedness—was 12.3 percent, or 8.7 percent after deducting \$594,000,000 received in rental and benefit payments from the Government.

We find, also, that even in the poorest year, 1932, there was a small net return, and with the exception of the years 1930-32, the average net return over the past 11 years has been more than 10 percent. Further, this return has been realized after the most liberal allowances for depreciation, and after full allowance for the estimated value of the services of the operator and the working members of his family. Before deducting the amounts credited for operators' and family wages, the average return on net capital invested has usually been more than 25 percent.

On the other hand, we find that all business corporations in the United States—almost 500,000—have operated at a loss during every one of the last 4 years, and probably even in 1935 scarcely broke even. Also, in the years of supposedly great prosperity from 1924 to 1929, the average rate of return of these same corporations was only a little more

than 5 percent on their invested capital—capital stock of all kinds, plus surplus and undivided profits—as compared with 11 percent return for operating farmers.

Finally, it is significant that in every year since 1924 there has been a steady reduction in the amount of farm indebtedness. In the earlier year the total net indebtedness is reported by the Government at \$9,873,000,000 and for

1934 the preliminary figure is \$6,950,000,000. Along with this decrease in indebtedness has come a continual decline in the amount of interest payable, which stood at \$731,000,000 in 1924 and was only \$472,000,000 in 1934. Possibly even more significant is the fact that between 1930 and 1934 total taxes payable on real estate and personal property dropped from \$600,000,000 to only \$387,000,000.

Estimated income of operating farmers in the United States compared with all corporate net income  
[In millions of dollars]

Year	Operators' net capital as reported by U. S. Department of Agriculture	Operators' net capital adjusted for dwellings and passenger automobiles <sup>1</sup>	Allowance already made for wages of operators and unpaid family labor at current wages	Amount available for capital and management, as reported by the U. S. Department of Agriculture <sup>2</sup>	Amount available (d) after adding back estimated depreciation on passenger autos <sup>3</sup>	Additional value of products retained for home consumption <sup>4</sup>	Amount available (d) adjusted for depreciation of autos, and value of products consumed	Real amount available for management and capital before allowance for wages of operators and their families (g+c)	Percent return on operators' net capital (adjustments indicated are cumulative)					Percent return on invested capital of all business corporations <sup>5</sup>
									As reported by U. S. Department of Agriculture	Net capital adjusted for dwellings and passenger autos	Income adjusted for depreciation on autos	Income adjusted for value of products consumed	Income adjusted for allowance for operators' and family wages	
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(d+a)	(d+b)	(e+b)	(g+b)	(h+b)	(n)
1924	34,389	29,178	4,405	1,394	1,494	1,697	3,191	7,596	4.1	4.8	5.1	11.0	26.1	4.5
1925	33,632	28,421	4,447	1,687	1,787	1,882	3,669	8,116	5.0	5.9	6.3	12.9	28.6	6.3
1926	33,559	28,348	4,534	986	1,086	1,822	2,908	7,442	2.9	3.5	3.8	10.3	26.3	5.7
1927	32,680	27,469	4,501	1,136	1,236	1,744	2,980	7,481	3.5	4.1	4.5	10.9	27.3	4.9
1928	32,945	27,734	4,491	1,105	1,205	1,742	2,947	7,438	3.4	4.0	4.3	10.6	26.8	5.8
1929	33,911	28,700	4,519	1,150	1,250	1,524	2,774	7,293	3.4	4.0	4.4	9.7	25.4	5.7
1930	34,119	28,908	4,096	-233	-133	1,424	1,291	5,387	-7	-8	-5	4.5	18.6	.9
1931	29,675	24,935	3,218	-825	-725	1,167	442	3,660	-2.8	-3.3	-2.9	1.8	14.7	-1.7
1932	23,659	19,390	2,460	-968	-868	960	92	2,552	-4.1	-5.0	-4.5	.5	13.2	-3.5
1933	18,670	14,872	2,297	386	486	997	1,483	3,780	2.1	2.6	3.3	10.0	25.4	-1.5
				108	208		1,205	3,502	6.6	6.7	6.1	8.1	23.6	
1934	20,129	16,331	2,586	882	982	1,033	2,015	4,601	4.4	5.4	6.0	12.3	28.2	-1.3
				288	388		1,421	4,007	6.1	6.8	6.2	8.7	24.5	
Average percent return, 11 years									1.9	2.3	2.7	8.6	23.7	2.3

<sup>1</sup> The value of dwellings and passenger automobiles is included in "net capital" as reported by the Government, column (a); but their estimated value is here deducted as their use is not properly considered an item of production cost. The value of all farm dwellings in 1930 was \$6,730,000,000. As farm operators owned approximately 70 percent of all land and buildings, 70 percent of the value of all farm dwellings was deducted in each year from 1924-30. This estimated value of owned farm dwellings was reduced 10 percent in 1931, 20 percent in 1932, and 30 percent in 1933 and 1934. Passenger automobiles on the farms, 4,134,675 in 1930, were estimated to have had an aggregate value of \$500,000,000 each year.

<sup>2</sup> After deducting (1) depreciation at 5 percent on all farm buildings, and at 21 percent on all implements and machinery, including passenger automobiles, (2) wages paid plus 37½ percent for assumed board and perquisites, and (3) the allowance indicated in column (c) for wages of operators and unpaid family labor at current wages.

<sup>3</sup> Depreciation on passenger automobiles estimated at approximately \$100,000,000 a year.

<sup>4</sup> The figures here listed based on local farm selling prices have been added by the Government in estimating farmers' net income. However, they must be at least doubled to indicate the relative position of the farmer as compared with the great majority of our population which is nonfarming, and customarily pays retail prices 2 or 3 times as high as prices received by the farmers.

<sup>5</sup> Based on Statistics of Income, U. S. Treasury Department.

<sup>6</sup> Excluding rental and benefit payments by A. A. A. In 1933, \$278,000,000; in 1934, \$594,000,000.

<sup>7</sup> Estimated.

Source of basic data: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Crops and Markets, July 1935, pp. 270-273; 1930 Census of the United States, Agriculture; U. S. Treasury Department, Statistics of Income (annual).

#### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, is it not a fact that an appropriation bill will be considered in general debate on Monday afternoon?

The SPEAKER. Monday is District day, but it is expected that an appropriation bill will be taken up during the day.

Mr. TABER. I should think the majority leadership would protect the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan.

There was no objection.

#### THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], the able minority leader, asked me to provide the figures showing the cost of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Since that time I have secured a report from the Public Printer showing the cost of the RECORD for the past 10 years, including the number of

pages in the RECORD for each session. I shall insert these figures in the RECORD for the information of the House.

Adding to the colloquy which took place this morning, I may say for myself and my colleagues on the House Committee on Printing that we believe the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should not become either a scrap book or a bulletin for propaganda. I believe the members of the Joint Committee on Printing concur in that sentiment.

If that is not the wish of the House of Representatives, rather than to make ourselves a nuisance here, I respectfully and seriously suggest that the House of Representatives elect a new Printing Committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBETH. My time has expired.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert this brief table of statistics in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, I am heartily in favor of every word the gentleman from North Carolina has said, and as far as I am personally concerned, I am willing to cooperate with the gentleman 100 percent to carry out that program. I do not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The table is as follows:

Cost of Congressional Record, including daily, index, biweekly, and bound editions, 69th Cong., 1st sess., to 74th Cong., 1st sess., inclusive, Dec. 7, 1925, to Aug. 26, 1935

Congress	Date convened	Date adjourned	Number of days	Number of issues	Total pages, bound	Average pages per issue based on bound volumes	Total cost
69th, 1st sess.	Dec. 7, 1925	July 3, 1926	209	176	13,935	97	\$715,456.79
69th, 2d sess.	Dec. 6, 1926	Mar. 3, 1927	88	74	6,318	86	340,830.34
70th, 1st sess.	Dec. 5, 1927	May 29, 1928	177	148	11,704	79	650,305.75
70th, 2d sess.	Dec. 3, 1928	Mar. 3, 1929	91	74	5,627	76	313,370.07
71st, 1st sess.	Apr. 15, 1929	Nov. 22, 1929	222	126	6,324	50	370,710.52
71st, 2d sess.	Dec. 2, 1929	July 3, 1930	214	166	13,366	80	766,616.07
71st, 3d sess.	Dec. 1, 1930	Mar. 3, 1931	93	71	7,862	111	421,008.17
72d, 1st sess.	Dec. 7, 1931	July 16, 1932	223	178	16,811	95	983,584.86
72d, 2d sess.	Dec. 5, 1932	Mar. 3, 1933	89	75	5,960	79	274,352.09
73d, 1st sess.	Mar. 9, 1933	June 15, 1933	99	79	6,670	84	292,452.83
73d, 2d sess.	Jan. 3, 1934	June 18, 1934	167	121	13,297	110	650,375.32
Total for 5 Congresses			1,672	1,288	107,874		5,779,062.81
Average for each Congress			334	258	21,575	84	1,155,812.56
74th, 1st sess.	Jan. 3, 1935	Aug. 26, 1935	236	179	15,742	88	829,806.36

#### WHAT OF AMERICA'S FUTURE?

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a speech delivered by our colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOLLISTER] before the Ohio Society of New York.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by my colleague from Ohio [Mr. HOLLISTER] at a meeting of the Ohio Society, Hotel Pennsylvania, New York City, on Monday evening, February 10, 1936:

As I listen day after day to addresses made on public affairs, it occurs to me with ever-increasing emphasis that, perhaps, we are all concerned too much with the present; let us say with that which immediately affects ourselves, and we have given too little thought to what portends in the future, to the effect which today's popular theories and practices will have on the next generation.

The political campaign has opened with a bang some weeks ahead of schedule, and the air is so full of tin cans and dead cats that it is sometimes hard to discuss important questions of public policy without growing hysterical. The administration is accused one day of out-fascisting Mussolini, and on the next of leading us on the road to Moscow, while opponents of the administration are conveniently grouped as "reactionary apostles of entrenched greed." It is not easy in this hurly-burly to keep our heads and assay truly existing trends in government and their effect on the future.

I was much impressed with one of the remarks which Al Smith made at the Liberty League dinner a few weeks ago. After touching briefly on his rise in the world, and the open door of opportunity which permitted this rise, he told the audience that he had 5 children and 10 grandchildren, and then said simply, "I want to keep that door open for them." My friends, are we today keeping the door open for the coming generations?

I am speaking to an audience consisting chiefly of those who have come to our greatest city for broader horizons; to find an outlet for abilities which were somewhat circumscribed in their native towns. You were looking for opportunity, and most of you found it. What gave this opportunity, and how has the picture changed?

Your opportunity came to you because of the fact that through our industrial system the natural resources of the land were developed through intelligence, inventive genius, and financial daring far faster than has occurred at any time or place before in the history of the world. We are told today that this resulted in the concentration of riches and power in the hands of a few; that the development of the machine makes it possible steadily to produce more with less manpower; and that we have therefore reached a stage where the whole scheme has become top-heavy and finally collapsed. The conclusion drawn is that the only thing which can save us is to redistribute our wealth and to revamp completely our industrial system through strict governmental regimentation.

I am by nature a doubter. I have preferred to question conclusions before adopting them, and before I can accept the ultimatum that my America must become the New Dealer's America I wish to test the facts on which their conclusions are based.

I shall spend little time on the question of the concentration of wealth. The demagogic statements of many of our so-called political leaders have been refuted time and time again. True it is that certain individuals or families have more of this world's goods than they deserve, but this is a situation which may not be completely eliminated under any system of government, least of all under any dictatorship known to history. The approach to the question should be whether or not there is a reasonably fair division of the earning power of the country. Needless to say, we

have never as yet arrived at such a fair division and will not for many years, but I believe that statistics will show that such a situation has been more nearly approached under our industrial system than under any other to which we can point.

Let us turn to the arguments for regimentation. Perhaps in this modern paradise of pseudo economists we have forgotten some basic economic principles, and the simplest one seems to be the one most forgotten today, which is that no individual, no family, no tribe, no nation ever got rich on having too few of the necessary and desirable things of life. Man, starting as a nomadic hunter, never left the stone age until he was able to make his hunting equipment more efficient, so that he might devote a little time to agriculture and housing, those two great problems which we still have with us today. In addition, barter, from which springs modern trade, only started when one man produced a surplus of something wanted by others which he could in turn exchange for something he wanted. Mankind has gone forward through the gospel of abundance and not through the gospel of scarcity.

"But," say the national planners, "admitting the truth of all that you have said in days when physical labor was the base of all increase in wealth, conditions have changed. Because of the machine mankind has developed so rapidly its ability to create surpluses of everything with the expenditure of less and less physical labor, that there is no way in which work can be given to all unless the tempo slows down and the available work is distributed among those able to work."

This argument is a clear evidence of the fundamental weakness of much of our present-day thinking. We do not think in long trends, not in centuries, or even in decades, but in terms of a few years at the most. A temporary phenomenon appears too often as the proof of an economic law. We are inclined to forget the years that separate us from the beast, and how far we have come up the ladder of civilization in that time. We are urged to scrap the slow wisdom of those years because, forsooth, there are temporary set-backs in the evolutionary process. We are told that the immutable laws of supply and demand have ceased to operate, and that we can by legislative or Executive fiat find a simple and improved substitute for the complicated interplay of economic forces which have developed over the centuries.

I am fully mindful of the distress of millions of my fellow Americans during the last few years, distress which has been all too little alleviated, but that the cause of this distress is the economic system under which we conduct our affairs I emphatically deny, and I have yet to hear any convincing argument to that effect.

If we once admit, which is too obvious for argument, that our system brought us to a period of greater happiness, contentment, opportunity, and hope than any other system ever brought any other country in the history of the world; if we once admit that we cannot point to any other nation where today those desirable things are enjoyed more by the common mass of the people than in our own country, by what right is it asserted that we will better our position by a change in the system? Truly it is a short-sighted policy to destroy our house because it may need certain minor alterations.

We have been taught that thrift, honesty, ambition, and hard work were cardinal virtues; that under the American system of liberty and opportunity the man of humble beginning who possessed these virtues and reasonable intelligence could aspire to any position in the political, economic, financial, or social life of our great democracy. Need I point to outstanding examples of this? The great majority of our Nation's leaders started life from humble beginnings. Should the temporary distress of a few years change the whole criterion of human endeavor?

I am told that the last few years have demonstrated the insecurity of our apparent prosperity. The human animal longs for security. It is the desire for security which causes man to work to lay aside something for the future which is responsible for the growth of banks, of building and loan associations, and of insurance companies. There have been terrible examples of deep distress from the loss of these surpluses during the past years, but

does that mean that we should surrender the whole principle of establishing security by personal endeavor rather than foster it by an attempt to avoid the abuses of the past? We should learn our lesson, of course, but the lesson should not be misread. It is only by opportunity that we can reach reasonable security.

Those of us who hold my views are met with the charge that "human rights are superior to property rights", but have we not done under our system more for human rights than has ever been done anywhere else? Can anyone deny that under our American system we have developed beyond all past experience great charitable, educational, and scientific institutions, not only from public money but to a large extent from the fortunes of those who have profited by the American idea of opportunity? A study of the facts will show that much of our progress in inventions which has so greatly increased the comforts and opportunities of our daily life has come from the scientific research carried on in institutions whose endowment rests on accumulations of wealth which the American idea of opportunity made possible.

I have given as the subject of my talk, What of America's Future? America's future rests on the type of citizen we develop to guide her destiny, and that type depends on the nature of the spiritual, economic, and political surroundings which we bequeath to the next generation. What are we doing for it?

We are told by those in power that in order to take care of the unemployed, business must be regimented; that officials at the seat of government must be in a position to tell all industry how to conduct itself, both with respect to the relations between employee and employer, but even with respect to the amount of production and the price charged. Gone will be the free play of competition under which we produced the best article for the cheapest price, with the increased buying power which inevitably resulted, and in its place will be price fixing and the preservation of obsolete equipment and methods, with a limited amount of goods produced and sold for a higher price.

We are told by those in power that the same principle should be applied to agriculture; that scarcity will bring prosperity and abundance will bring ruin—a complete reversal of all that experience in the past has demonstrated.

We are told by those in power that the price level should be manipulated to achieve a certain relationship to the price level of certain specific years, when any orthodox economist knows a price level by itself has no value, the important thing being the relationship of the average wage to the price level, which relationship controls, of course, the buying power of the country.

We are told by those in power that the old virtue of hard work is outmoded, for we offer as largess from the Government to those out of work a wage which in many cases makes the recipient unwilling to take a job when offered. We are told that the old virtue of thrift is outmoded, for we plan to take away the savings of the thrifty and distribute them among their more unfortunate or less thrifty neighbors, reversing the moral of the old fable of the ant and the grasshopper. We have fostered the "gimme" psychology, so that it is no longer the fashion to work for something which is desired but rather to go and ask the Federal Government for a hand-out.

When thrift and hard work are discouraged, what becomes of ambition? Ambition is the desire to better one's self along some chosen line; but if we close the door to betterment and compel all to preserve the mediocre level of the average, can ambition longer flourish?

And what becomes of honesty when the Federal Government itself sets an example of repudiation of its obligations? It has been said that civilization is based on contract. All faith, credit, trust, whatever synonym you wish to use for the basic principle, is based on the theory that we can have confidence in a promise; but when the Government itself breaks its promises, what can you expect of its citizens?

But the tale is not yet told. I have indicated how we are breaking down the spiritual values of life by the repression of the homely virtues of the past. In addition, from the material side, we are loading on the future generation a burden under which it will groan for years.

Facts and figures about Government finance are, unfortunately, dull reading, but they paint the background for impending national tragedy. I shall assume that the rough totals of our national debt and of our continuing Budget deficits are known to most of you. The important question is not so much the exact amounts involved as the implications which continued Budget unbalancing raise. No one can tell at what point the national credit will collapse. Unfortunately history shows that the exact time of such a happening cannot be anticipated. It is on us before we know it, and then it is too late to avert it. Repudiation of Government obligations, with all the horror which that implies, necessarily follows.

The important thing to note is not only that our expenditures continue to exceed greatly our revenues, but that it would be impossible to increase revenues to close the gap without drastic changes in our whole taxation structure, and there is no evidence of any attempt to make such drastic changes. How many of you know that all of the ordinary appropriation bills which we are now considering in Congress, and which do not include emergency spending, exceed the amounts of these appropriations for the current year? How many know that in 1934 the income of those with incomes in excess of \$25,000 totaled only one and one-half billions, of which something over 20 percent went for income taxes; while those with incomes of less than \$25,000 per year received about eleven billions, of which 1½ percent went for

taxes. The total income of all those having incomes in excess of \$5,000 per year was only about four billions. It is thus manifest that if we confiscated all the income of the wealthy we would still be far short of balancing our Budget, and we would just about do it if we confiscated the income of all the reasonably well to do. We cannot therefore approach Budget balancing on our present rate of expenditure unless income taxes are changed drastically to affect even the poor.

There are, of course, other sources of revenue, but will we increase the taxes on railroads when their total operations are at a deficit? Will we increase corporation taxes beyond the increases which are already effective for 1936? Will we adopt a general sales tax which is, of course, a direct tax on the consumer? I wonder how generally known it is that the new taxes which went into effect the first of this year will raise about \$400,000,000 more than the taxes of last year, and yet the President's 1937 Budget will still be out of balance by some four billions.

I do not want to get into a discussion of methods of taxation, but I wish to bring home the burden which we are casting on the future generation, for if we continue to spend and refuse to raise the revenue to meet the expenditure, there are only two alternatives. The revenue must be raised in the future to retire the debt we are now creating, or the Government must repudiate its obligations. There is no other way out.

Do not forget what heavy taxation means. It reduces accumulated wealth and curtails income. Industry depends upon these items to go forward, so as taxation increases, the march of progress decreases. Taking away savings by taxation destroys the initiative to save. It is from the savings of the people that government in turn must borrow if Budgets are unbalanced; while industry must borrow from the savings of the people for long-term capital investment. When taxation exceeds a reasonable proportion of current income there must of necessity be a slowing down of economic development.

I am only scratching the surface of vast subjects to which days of thought and discussion should be given. I have not touched at all on the abstract problem of individual liberty and how it crumbles in the grip of the authoritarian state, for the time is too short to handle this subject adequately. That is another factor to consider when we visualize the heritage of the next generation.

What is the answer to the rhetorical questions which I have asked tonight? Do we belong to a generation which will turn back the clock and reverse the wheels of progress? We are the inheritors of a great tradition, of a boundless national wealth and power and vision bequeathed to us by those who went before. Am I stirred by groundless fears when I seem to hear a clear voice calling to us from the coming years and speaking something in this way:

"Oh, you short-sighted, selfish elders! What have you done to us? You were bequeathed the virtues of thrift, energy, and ambition, and at the same time the vast resources which the generation ahead of you developed. You inherited the earth. True, you suffered, but so did your predecessors. Did you face your tribulations in the spirit of the American pioneer, or did you whine and run to your Government for help and protection when the storm cloud broke? What right did you have to mortgage our inheritance and exchange your birthright of liberty for a fancied security? You have delivered us up to the bondage of an autocratic government. You have weighed us down with a burden of debt from which we can never emerge. You have closed the door of opportunity to us, and have taken away from us initiative and ambition. Through your weakness and cowardice you have transformed the triumphantly advancing America you inherited into a country of economic and spiritual stagnation."

Let us pray to God that we shall never have to answer such a fearful indictment.

#### CONSERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

Mr. LORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LORD. Mr. Speaker, when the processing tax became effective our merchants had to weigh all their cotton goods on their shelves, for they had to pay a tax to the Government. This tax fell very heavily on the merchants of our State, for they could not pass very much of it on to their customers. Of course, when goods came in the prices were advanced, and they added the tax to what the customers bought.

The tax on pork added to the living expenses of all our people, the tax on wheat and corn increased the cost of feed to our dairymen, their feed coming from the Western States, adding a great deal to their cost of operation. They did not receive any more for their milk on account of these processing taxes, so they have suffered very greatly by the A. A. A. legislation. This tax fell on all of our people, but it was hardest for the farmers, dairymen, and poor people, who had to pay the advanced cost of living. New York State paid a greater portion of the processing tax than any other State and received relatively no benefit whatever.

The Government, in its reciprocal trade agreement with Canada, lowered the tariff on milk and milk products so that they come into keen competition with those of New York State as well as the other States of the Nation, have lowered the tariff on lumber and pulpwoods so they came into stiff competition with New York State, as well as the other States, for which we have received no benefits.

The substitute A. A. A. bill that is before us today again proposes to subsidize the western and southern farmers by taking land out of production and putting it into alfalfa and other grasses which will be fed to dairy cows and cattle and so put them into direct competition with New York and the other dairy and cattle-raising States.

This is a good political move on the part of the majority, to use a half billion dollars for so-called soil conservation, but its real effect is to make the next election sure for Democracy by subsidizing the Southern and Western States at the expense of the dairy industry.

In these payments New York State will, as in the past, have to pay the greatest share of any State in the Nation and not only will not receive any benefit but it will make the lot of our farmers worse than it is today by bringing more dairy cows into competition with our market.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this bill does not prevail.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DRIVER, for 1 week, on account of important business.

To Mr. LESINSKI, for 1 week, on account of important official business.

To Mr. LEWIS of Maryland on account of illness.

To Mr. MILLER, for 5 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. SHANLEY, for 1 day, on account of official business.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3399. An act for the relief of Rosalie Piar Sprecher (nee Rosa Piar); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1381. An act to amend Public Law No. 249, Seventy-first Congress, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of material no longer needed by the Navy";

H. R. 1415. An act to provide for the establishment of the Richmond National Battlefield Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1470. An act for the relief of Carl A. Butler;

H. R. 1867. An act for the relief of Orville E. Clark;

H. R. 2110. An act for the relief of W. A. Harriman;

H. R. 2156. An act for the relief of Cecelia Callahan;

H. R. 2157. An act for the relief of Howard Donovan;

H. R. 2165. An act for the relief of Charles A. Gettys;

H. R. 2527. An act for the relief of Mrs. Amber Walker;

H. R. 2923. An act for the relief of Misner Jane Humphrey;

H. R. 3557. An act for the relief of Helena C. VonGroning and Stephan VonGroning;

H. R. 3565. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to effect exchange of certain rights-of-way in Hawaii;

H. R. 3864. An act for the relief of Gladys Robbins;

H. R. 4047. An act granting 6 months' pay to James Zanetti;

H. R. 4084. An act for the relief of Charles D. Jeronimus;

H. R. 4171. An act for the relief of Look Hoon and Lau Hoon Leong;

H. R. 4210. An act for the relief of Anthony Nowakowski;

H. R. 4292. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant rights-of-way to the Arlington & Fairfax Railway Co. across the Fort Myer Reservation, Va.;

H. R. 4777. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Army of Vincent P. Rousseau;

H. R. 4925. An act to authorize and direct the Comptroller General to settle and allow the claim of George P. Money for fees for services rendered;

H. R. 5181. An act for the relief of the Progressive Commercial Co. of Philadelphia, Pa.;

H. R. 5474. An act for the relief of Lt. M. T. Grubham;

H. R. 5525. An act for the relief of George Current;

H. R. 5747. An act for the relief of Gordon McGee;

H. R. 5876. An act for the relief of Elmer H. Ackerson;

H. R. 5916. An act to authorize the conveyance by the United States to the State of Michigan of the former United States lighthouse supply depot, St. Joseph, Mich., for State naval force purposes;

H. R. 5964. An act for the relief of Carl F. Yeager;

H. R. 6254. An act for the relief of David N. Aiken;

H. R. 6708. An act to authorize the presentation of a Distinguished Flying Cross to Lt. Col. Francis T. Evans, United States Marine Corps;

H. R. 7001. An act for the relief of Alice Markham Kavanaugh;

H. R. 7486. An act to authorize the appointment of midshipmen from among honor graduates of "honor schools" and from among members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps;

H. R. 7875. An act to provide for the transfer of certain land in the city of Charlotte, Mich., to such city;

H. R. 8024. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to dispose of material no longer needed by the Army;

H. R. 8172. An act to authorize the transfer by the United States to the county of Mohave, Ariz., of all public lands in sections 20, 28, and 30, township 20 north, range 15 west, Gila and Salt River meridian, for public park, recreational, and other municipal purposes;

H. R. 8437. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice the healing art in the District of Columbia to Dr. Arthur B. Walker;

H. R. 8821. An act to define the crime of bribery and to provide for its punishment;

H. R. 8872. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Woman's Club of the city of Paducah, Ky., the silver service in use on the U. S. S. *Paducah*;

H. R. 8966. An act for the relief of World War soldiers who were discharged from the Army because of minority or misrepresentation of age; and

H. J. Res. 356. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Pan American Exposition to be held in Tampa, Fla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, February 22, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

675. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 21, 1936, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Seaside Harbor, Oreg., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935 (H. Doc. No. 414); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

676. A letter from the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, transmitting his third annual report, covering operations for the year 1936 (H. Doc. No. 325); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

# REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. S. 2603. An act to authorize the Attorney General to determine and pay certain claims against the Government for damage to person or property in sum not exceeding \$500 in any one case; with amendment (Rept. No. 2034). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 399. An act to amend sections 416 and 417 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 2054). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALMISANO: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 3035. An act to provide for enforcing the lien of the District of Columbia upon real estate bid off in its name when offered for sale for arrears of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2055). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 10975. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Marshy Hope Creek, a tributary of the Nanticoke River, at and within a few miles of Federalsburg, Caroline County, Md., with a view to the controlling of floods; with amendment (Rept. No. 2056). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 11365. A bill relating to the filing of copies of income returns, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2057). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 11006. A bill providing for the examination of the Nueces River in the State of Texas for flood-control purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2058). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

# REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. EKWALL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1440. A bill for the relief of Arthur W. Bradshaw; with amendment (Rept. No. 2026). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARLSON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2262. A bill for the relief of William H. Locke; with amendment (Rept. No. 2027). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOUSTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3388. A bill for the relief of Jessie D. Bowman; with amendment (Rept. No. 2028). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4085. A bill for the relief of Joseph Watkins; without amendment (Rept. No. 2029). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SEGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4779. A bill for the relief of Capt. Chester Gracie; with amendment (Rept. No. 2030). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5974. A bill for the relief of Thelma L. Edmunds, Mrs. J. M. Padgett, Myrtis E. Posey, Mrs. J. D. Mathis, Sr., Fannie Harrison, Annie R. Colgan, and Grace Whitlock; with amendment (Rept. No. 2031). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6208. A bill for the relief of Joseph Pethersky, of Port Deposit, Md.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2032). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7237. A bill for the relief of the State of New York Insurance Department as liquidator; with amendment (Rept. No. 2033). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARLSON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7330. A bill for the relief of Alfred T. Johnston; with amendment (Rept. No. 2035). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7996. A bill for the relief of Sallie Gillespie; with amendment (Rept. No. 2036). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8033. A bill for the relief of Tina Filmore; with amendment (Rept. No. 2037). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8034. A bill for the relief of Mae Pouland; with amendment (Rept. No. 2038). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOUSTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8321. A bill for the relief of Julia Long; with amendment (Rept. No. 2039). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOUSTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8322. A bill for the relief of Merwin A. Kiel; with amendment (Rept. No. 2040). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8413. A bill for the relief of Linda Wright Ward; with amendment (Rept. No. 2041). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8521. A bill for the relief of Elsie O'Brine; with amendment (Rept. No. 2042). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9058. A bill for the relief of the Baker-Whiteley Coal Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2043). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9170. A bill for the relief of Montie Hermanson; with amendment (Rept. No. 2044). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9171. A bill for the relief of Myrtle T. Grooms; with amendment (Rept. No. 2045). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GWYNNE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9369. A bill for the relief of John L. Summers, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department; and Frank White, G. F. Allen, H. T. Tate, and W. O. Woods, former Treasurers of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2046). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10521. A bill for the relief of Joseph Mossew; without amendment (Rept. No. 2047). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11231. A bill for the relief of Rasmus Bech; without amendment (Rept. No. 2048). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1111. An act for the relief of Alfred L. Hudson and Walter K. Jeffers; without amendment (Rept. No. 2049). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. S. 2719. An act for the relief of Capt. Guy L. Hartman; without amendment (Rept. No. 2050). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 2889. An act to authorize settlement, allowance, and payment of certain claims; with amendment (Rept. No. 2051). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. S. 2961. An act for the relief of Peter Cymboluk; with amendment (Rept. No. 2052). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. S. 3173. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay men formerly enlisted as members of Battery D, One Hundred and Ninety-seventh Coast Artillery (Antiaircraft), New Hampshire National Guard, for armory training during the period from November 1, 1932, to July 1, 1933; with amendment (Rept. No. 2053). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7798) granting an increase of pension to Kate M. Farrell; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10698) granting a pension to Patricia Swan; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOEHNE: A bill (H. R. 11364) to repeal section 55 (b) of the Revenue Act of 1934; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 11365) relating to the filing of copies of income returns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL: A bill (H. R. 11366) to provide for the admission of 50 Filipinos to the United States Military Academy pending the consummation of the independence of the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11367) to provide for the admission of 50 Filipinos to the United States Naval Academy pending the consummation of the independence of the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KRAMER: A bill (H. R. 11368) to amend title I of the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 11369) to authorize the construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTE HILL: A bill (H. R. 11370) to prevent persons not citizens of the United States from occupying lands within the Yakima Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. QUINN: A bill (H. R. 11371) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the borough of Wilkesburg, Pa.; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11372) to amend Public Law No. 215, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11373) prescribing tolls to be paid for the use of locks on all rivers in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIROVICH: A bill (H. R. 11374) to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 11375) to repeal a proviso relating to teaching or advocating communism in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and appearing in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 11376) to repeal certain provisions relating to compensation paid to officers and employees of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN: A bill (H. R. 11377) to amend section 605 of the Revenue Act of 1932; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDOLPH: Resolution (H. Res. 424) endorsing the George Washington Foundation National Health Shrine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TABER: Resolution (H. Res. 426) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish certain information concerning producers to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Agriculture.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCHANAN: A bill (H. R. 11378) for the relief of Col. Benjamin F. Delamater; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 11379) for the relief of William H. Milton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DALY: A bill (H. R. 11380) for the relief of Leib Milgrom; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DIMOND: A bill (H. R. 11381) granting an increase of pension to Clara B. Kirkendall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOCKWEILER: A bill (H. R. 11382) for the relief of Edward Martin Howard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11383) for the relief of Ingvarda Otelie Tonning; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FIESINGER: A bill (H. R. 11384) granting a pension to Elinor A. Babcock; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREGORY: A bill (H. R. 11385) granting a pension to Ethel Drew; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KNIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 11386) for the relief of Cecille Gamble; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 11387) for the relief of Jack F. Kerby; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAIN: A bill (H. R. 11388) for the relief of Edward P. Sheppard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 11389) granting a pension to Mae W. Vince; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'NEAL: A bill (H. R. 11390) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Cragg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11391) for the relief of Will Castleman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11392) for the relief of William Hill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 11393) for the relief of George W. Collins; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ZIONCHECK: A bill (H. R. 11394) granting a pension to Harriett Ware; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11395) for the relief of Alexander E. Kovner; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10221. By Mr. BEITER: Petition of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N. Y., urging enactment of Representative BEITER's bill, providing for the improvement of the New York State Barge Canal from Three Rivers to Buffalo; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

10222. Also, petition of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Buffalo, N. Y., urging enactment of the Nye-Kvale amendment (S. 3309) and the Wagner-Costigan antilynching bill (S. 52); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10223. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, opposing the Pettengill bill (H. R. 3263); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10224. By Mr. GREENWOOD: Petition of citizens residing in towns served by star route no. 33214, requesting enactment of legislation to extend all existing star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10225. Also, petition of citizens residing in towns served by star route no. 33179, requesting enactment of legislation to extend all existing star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10226. Also, petition of citizens residing in towns served by star route no. 33187, requesting enactment of legislation to extend all existing star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10227. Also, petition of citizens residing in towns served by star route no. 33185, requesting enactment of legislation to extend all existing star-route contracts and increase the

compensation thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10228. Also, petition of citizens residing in towns served by star route no. 33190, requesting enactment of legislation to extend all existing star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10229. Also, petition of citizens residing in towns served by star route no. 33193, requesting enactment of legislation to extend all existing star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10230. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Resolution of the Seneca (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce, urging legislation that will place agriculture on a parity with industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10231. By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of John Wenzel and others, of Allendale, N. J., urging Congress to reenact a prohibition law for the District of Columbia by passing House bill 8739 during the early session of the present Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10232. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of Saltser & Weinsier, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring extension of title I of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10233. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Philadelphia Bar Association; to the Committee on the Library.

10234. Also, petition of the Lawyers' Association of Kansas City, Mo.; to the Committee on the Library.

10235. By Mr. KNIFFIN: Petition of Sarah Schofer, of Hicksville, Ohio, representing 30 women of the Acme Literary Club, asking for the immediate enactment of the Guyer bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10236. Also, petition of J. A. Schofer, pastor of St. John's Lutheran Church, Hicksville, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of the Guyer bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## SENATE

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1936

(Legislative day of Thursday, Jan. 16, 1936)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, February 20, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Clark	Johnson	Robinson
Ashurst	Connally	Keyes	Russell
Austin	Coolidge	King	Schwellenbach
Bachman	Costigan	Logan	Sheppard
Barbour	Couzens	Loneragan	Smith
Barkley	Davis	Long	Steiwer
Benson	Dieterich	McAdoo	Thomas, Okla.
Bilbo	Donahey	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Bone	Duffy	Metcalf	Townsend
Borah	Fletcher	Minton	Trammell
Brown	Frazier	Murphy	Truman
Bulkley	George	Murray	Tydings
Bulow	Gerry	Norris	Vandenberg
Burke	Gore	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Hale	Overton	Wagner
Capper	Harrison	Pittman	Wheeler
Caraway	Hatch	Pope	White
Chavez	Hayden	Radcliffe	

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON] is absent because of illness, and that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are necessarily absent.

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the Senator from Ten-

nessee [Mr. McKELLAR] are absent because of illness; that the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness in his family, and that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. MCGILL], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK], the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3780) to promote the conservation and profitable use of agricultural land resources by temporary Federal aid to farmers, and by providing for a permanent policy of Federal aid to States for such purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 488) to close Military Road.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 10490. An act to amend chapter 9 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and

H. R. 11138. An act to extinguish tax liabilities and tax liens arising out of the Tobacco, Cotton, and Potato Acts.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a resolution (H. Res. 425), as follows:

*Resolved*, That the bill (S. 3410) to exempt from taxation receipts from the operation of Olympic Games if donated to the State of California, the city of Los Angeles, and the county of Los Angeles, in the opinion of this House contravenes that clause of the Constitution of the United States requiring revenue bills to originate in the House of Representatives, and is an infringement of the prerogatives of this House, and that said bill be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1381. An act to amend Public Law No. 249, Seventy-first Congress, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of material no longer needed by the Navy";

H. R. 1415. An act to provide for the establishment of the Richmond National Battlefield Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1470. An act for the relief of Carl A. Butler;

H. R. 1867. An act for the relief of Orville E. Clark;

H. R. 2110. An act for the relief of W. A. Harriman;

H. R. 2156. An act for the relief of Cecelia Callahan;

H. R. 2157. An act for the relief of Howard Donovan;

H. R. 2165. An act for the relief of Charles A. Gettys;

H. R. 2527. An act for the relief of Mrs. Amber Walker;

H. R. 2923. An act for the relief of Misner Jane Humphrey;

H. R. 3557. An act for the relief of Helena C. VonGroning and Stephan VonGroning;

H. R. 3565. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to effect exchange of certain rights-of-way in Hawaii;

H. R. 3864. An act for the relief of Gladys Robbins;

H. R. 4047. An act granting 6 months' pay to James Zanetti;

H. R. 4084. An act for the relief of Charles D. Jeronimus;